

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



JUNE 15th, 1933

VOLUME X

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL No 11

TEN CENTS
CONTENTS
OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number II

Published fortnightly in Russian, German,
French, Chinese, Spanish and English.

1. LETTER OF THE E.C.C.I. TO THE I.L.P.
(See page 363)
 2. HOT-BEDS OF IMPERIALIST WAR AND INTER-
VENTION.
(See page 363)
 3. POLITICAL LESSONS OF THE FIRST OF MAY.
(See page 368)
 4. THE INTERVENTIONIST CAMPAIGN OF THE
DIEHARDS AND PROLETARIAN RESISTANCE IN
ENGLAND.
BY PAT DEVINE
(See page 374)
 5. THE AMSTERDAM INTERNATIONAL. THE FALL
OF THE A.D.G.B. AND THE TASKS OF THE
COMMUNISTS.
(See page 379)
 6. THE CONSTITUTION FOR THE ENSLAVEMENT OF
THE INDIAN PEOPLE AND THE POLICY OF THE
INDIAN BOURGEOISIE.
BY VALIA
(See page 385)
 7. NATIONAL PROBLEMS IN CHINA.
BY GEORGE SAFAROV
(See page 391)
 8. DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL
COMMISSION IN THE MATTER OF FELIX WOLF
AND ERICH WOLLENBERG
(See page 400)
-
-

LETTER OF THE E.C.C.I. TO THE I.L.P.

TO the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain:—

"The Secretariat of the Communist International welcomes the decision of the Forty-first Annual Conference of the Independent Labour Party to leave the Second International and to approach the Communist International 'with a view to ascertaining in what way the I.L.P. may assist in the work of the International.'

"During the last few weeks the I.L.P. has taken part in united front activity with the Communist Party against Fascism in Germany and the menace of a new imperialist war, and now the Conference has decided to follow the example of the Lancashire and London Districts, where the I.L.P. members also agreed with the Communists to extend the fighting united front of the workers, the vital question of the struggle confronting the unemployed, the railway workers, the textile operatives, etc.

"This common struggle with the Communists has taken place at a time when German Social-democracy has passed over to the camp of Fascism, and when the march of events has demonstrated the bankruptcy of the policy of class collaboration pursued by the Second International

and its sections, including the Labour Party of Great Britain.

"Under these conditions thousands of I.L.P.ers have realised from their own experience the necessity for the unity of all revolutionary proletarian forces which base themselves on the policy of irreconcilable class struggle.

"The unity of all the revolutionary proletarian forces in Great Britain on the basis of irreconcilable class struggle, upon which the programme and tactic of the Communist International is founded, would be a turning point in the history of the British Labour movement and would open up an international perspective for the revolutionary workers of the I.L.P.

"The Secretariat of the Communist International is firmly convinced that the decision of the Conference majority in favour of approaching the Communist International will meet with the warm sympathy of the members of the I.L.P. and of all advanced workers in Britain.

"The Secretariat of the Communist International, for its part, expresses its readiness to commence negotiations with the National Administrative Council of the I.L.P."

HOT-BEDS OF IMPERIALIST WARS AND INTERVENTION

LENIN has spoken of the necessity of explaining to the masses the great secrecy of the birth of imperialist war.* This great secret of the birth of a new imperialist war and intervention against the U.S.S.R. is now being deciphered before the great masses. The latest and sharpest outbreak of the world economic crisis has given a new impetus to the sharpening of all the basic contradictions of imperialism.

The end of the relative stabilisation of capitalism, the growth of contradictions leading to colossal and violent collisions between the States on the international arena, and the classes within each country, have led to each incident, each event, no matter how insignificant in itself, each provocation developing into a danger of military collisions.

The sharpening of the class contradictions within the different countries still further deepens the inevitable contradictions in the camp of imperialism, while the sharpening of the contradictions between the imperialist Powers in turn aggravates the class

contradictions within the individual countries. Class battles break out. Battles ensue between imperialism and the toilers of the colonies, *their sharpening causing a very tense situation in the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the imperialist world.*

This interweaving and inter-connection of the class struggle in the separate countries with the struggle between the imperialist Powers, of the battles of attacking imperialism with the growing national and revolutionary movements in the colonies, and finally, above all, the sharpening of the struggle between the two worlds, creates, under the conditions of the relative stabilisation of capitalism a situation in which any shot, fired on any border, may precipitate a new world war.

In Danzig the storm troops have occupied the building of the trade unions; the workers responded to this by a general strike. *The Danzig events may lead to a clash between Poland and Germany. Fascist Germany has raised the question of an Anschluss with Austria.* In Austria itself an intense struggle is taking place for and against the Anschluss, and this struggle may develop into a starting point for a world

* See "The Attitude of the Proletariat to War."

war between Hitler's Germany and imperialist France and its vassals.

The same struggle may lead to a break between German and Italian fascism on the international arena. In Jugo-Slavia the sharpening of the class struggle and the fight of the oppressed nationalities against the military fascist régime of the Serbian bourgeoisie may lead to a crisis of the State. But the crisis of the Jugo-Slavian State may develop into a starting point for a clash between Jugo-Slavia (and France) and Italian imperialism.

German fascism is already gasping under the blows of the irreconcilable external and internal contradictions. But German fascism has not only become a bearer of civil war against the proletariat, but also of the most savage, most barbarous chauvinism and of imperialist war. At the same time as it is trying to ensure a way out of the impasse and isolation, German fascism is also acting as an open advocate of the anti-Soviet intervention, persistently urging its plan of solving the dispute between Germany and the Versailles bloc at the expense of the U.S.S.R. (the occupation of Soviet Ukraine). At the same time French imperialism is establishing a cordon around Germany, preparing for a preventive war against German fascism. German fascism seeks a way out of its internal contradictions in an imperialist war against Poland. Polish fascism seeks to solve its own internal contradictions by means of a war against German imperialism.

In the Far East the war of Japanese imperialism against China, the capture of Jehol and Chahar by Japanese forces, the advance of Japanese imperialism upon Northern China is causing and will undoubtedly launch a new outburst of the national revolutionary struggle. But the expansion of the Japanese invasion strengthens the antagonism between the United States and Japan. The deep internal crisis of the entire internal structure of Japanese imperialism drives it on to fresh and fresh conquests and aggression. But the gravest crisis shaking the entire economy of the United States drives American imperialism to a more active policy in the Pacific. At the same time Japanese imperialism seeks to satiate its robbers' appetite in the Far East, and stave off the clash between the imperialists in the Pacific, by provoking an anti-Soviet war. Hence the conflicts on the Chinese-Eastern Railway, the constant provocations against the U.S.S.R., the extremely tense situation in the Far East.

The international situation is at present so tense that any incident, any event, any provocation may kindle the fire of an imperialist war—or intervention against the U.S.S.R., *Three definite hot-beds of war and intervention appear on the volcanic surface of the capitalist world at the present time.* The Japanese hot-bed in China, which is already ablaze, may spread the Soviet Far East. Then there is the hot-bed of

war between fascist Germany and the Versailles bloc which is speedily developing, and may burst out at any moment. Finally, there is the hot-bed of war between Italy and Jugo-Slavia who is supported by France. Concurrently the basic imperialist contradiction between England and the United States, threatens to break out in war in the relatively more distant future, and has already led, not only to a sharp economic war, but also to a local military clash in Latin-America.

The approach of the new series of imperialist wars has been brought much nearer. It is difficult to foresee or forecast whether this series of wars will break out within a few weeks or a few months, but historical periods are brief, and for this reason *separate imperialist groups strive desperately to postpone the outbreak of war in the imperialist camp by means of the provocation of a new military intervention in the U.S.S.R.*

British imperialism has taken advantage of the trial of the British engineers in Moscow to stir up an anti-Soviet campaign on an unheard-of scale. The "National" Government of Great Britain has already proclaimed an embargo against the U.S.S.R., thereby declaring an economic war. British imperialism has given the signal for the consolidation of the anti-Soviet forces. It has given the signal for an attempt to solve the insoluble and irreconcilable contradictions in the camp of imperialism at the expense of the land of rising socialism—the U.S.S.R.

This signal has been picked up by German fascism. It is no accident that the provocations and challenges of German fascism against the U.S.S.R. coincided with the action taken by British imperialism against her. It is no accident that the proclamation of economic war upon the U.S.S.R. by the "National" Government of England coincides with the provocations of the Japanese militarists in the Far East, especially on the Chinese-Eastern Railway. Nor is it an accident that the Japanese militarists, who are converting Manchuria into a jumping-off ground for an attack upon the U.S.S.R., are now engaging in open provocations while the British Intelligence Service is organising an uprising in Sinkiang, in Chinese Turkestan, in order to create a base for diverse acts against the U.S.S.R., in order to set up in the East, in company with Japanese imperialism, a wall between the U.S.S.R. and revolutionary China. The Japanese army is marching upon Kalgar, and the distance from Kalgar to the Mongolian People's Republic is not great. At the same time, agents of British imperialism are attempting to establish in Chinese Turkestan a sort of Manchukuo, a new "Moslem" State.

Hitler's advent to power in Germany has forced French imperialism to temporarily abandon the rôle of the leader and pioneer of the anti-Soviet front. But France's place does not remain empty, and is now

held at the moment by British imperialism. *The rôle of instigator of military intervention against the U.S.S.R. has passed into the hands of the British Conservatives, who have formed a bloc with the National Liberals and MacDonald's National Labourites.*

Rosenberg, the National Socialist expert on foreign affairs, has been ridiculed and discredited in England, but it would be the greatest error to regard the failure of Rosenberg's buffoonery as a failure of the conspiracy between British imperialism and German fascism against the U.S.S.R. German fascism has not by any means abandoned the attempt to arrive at an understanding with France and Poland against the U.S.S.R. British imperialism too is making every effort to bring about such a compromise, however great the difficulties in its realisation may be. Rosenberg's clumsy, droll attempts have failed, but this failure can no more be regarded as *final* than his previous failure.

A new series of interventions is also approaching at an accelerated tempo. The entire international situation is marked by the fact that a race is *now taking place between two wars, a war in the camp of the imperialists or a counter-revolutionary interventionist war against the U.S.S.R.*

We do not mean to say by this that to-day the task of the revolutionary proletariat, that of forestalling the imperialist war, forestalling the military intervention against the U.S.S.R. by a revolution, no longer exists. This task has not been removed; only the struggle, the class struggle can and will solve the question of whether the revolution will outstrip the imperialist war and the military intervention against the U.S.S.R.—or the imperialist war and the military intervention against the U.S.S.R. will outstrip the *revolution, which will unquestionably arise out of the new series of wars and interventions.* There can be no doubt that the victory of fascism in Germany has set up additional temporary difficulties to the revolutionary proletariat on this very important section, in the solution of the task of *outstripping* the imperialist war and intervention by revolution.

History has not yet finally decided whether the revolution will forestall imperialist war and intervention, or war and intervention forestall the revolution. Nor has history decided, as yet, whether the war between the imperialists will outstrip military intervention of the militarists against the U.S.S.R., or vice versa.

On this question it is necessary to draw a distinction between the situation in the Far East, and in the West. In the Far East the prospect of intervention against the U.S.S.R. appears *at the present time*, more imminent than that of a war between Japan and the United States. On the contrary, in the West the prospect of a war over the Versailles Treaty appears, *at present*, more probable than that of an attack upon

the U.S.S.R. But it must be remembered that an intervention in the Far East may easily develop into a world war, and on the other hand, that a military conflict over the Versailles Treaty may develop into an intervention against the U.S.S.R., and finally, that both the one and the other may develop into a revolution.

The gigantic sharpening of the imperialist contradictions cannot but lead to a crisis, to the sharpest outbreak of these contradictions at the Geneva Conference.

Petty-bourgeois pacifism and the Second International describe the Geneva Disarmament Conference as a powerful factor of peace. Now it is clear to all that the Geneva Conference has merely served as a cover for the preparation of a new imperialist war, that it has given a new impetus to the frantic race of armaments. At the present time the Geneva Disarmament Conference may provide the last impetus to a military clash between the Versailles and anti-Versailles imperialist blocs.

Roosevelt's message was calculated, among other things, to revive the Geneva Conference. Hitler's "moderate" speech aimed at deferring the explosion of the Geneva Conference to *gain time* for actual arming, under cover of talk about disarmament. Roosevelt's message had the object of bringing pressure to bear upon German and partly also upon French imperialism and making a threat against imperialist Japan.

The League of Nations, which had been completely exposed as an instrument of war, is apparently historically ending its days. The League of Nations has served as an instrument of struggle of the imperialists against the U.S.S.R. and the nations of the colonies. This instrument has been controlled in the main by French and British imperialism, and these two countries have pursued a policy detrimental to the U.S.S.R. and the colonies and semi-colonies, promoting the common interests of imperialism. The sharpening of the contradictions in the camp of imperialism is already undermining and will undoubtedly soon completely wreck the League of Nations.

Japan has already resigned from the League. It is quite possible that Germany, too, will soon leave the League of Nations. Hitler has already issued the threat that Germany will quit the Geneva Conference and the League of Nations. And should not Italian imperialism follow immediately it will be only to paralyse the policy of French imperialism, which has gained a decisive influence within the League.

The Second International maintained that the League of Nations was an instrument of peace, that it will build the world along democratic and socialist lines. How ridiculous these phrases of the Second International sound, how mocking they appear in the face of reality.

The sharpening of the contradictions in the imperialist camp could not but lead to the disintegration of the Second International. This process is speedily developing before our very eyes precisely according to the sharpening of the imperialist contradictions.

Through the mouth of Wels the German Social-Democracy has declared its unqualified support of the foreign policy of German fascism. It has again confirmed this by the vote of the Social-Democratic fraction in the Reichstag. In order to be able to give greater support to Hitler's policy, Wels has resigned from the Bureau of the Second International. Following him the reformist trade unions, shortly before their death, withdrew from the international federations and the German Federation of Trade Unions left the Amsterdam International. The German social-fascists voted in the Reichstag in favour of the resolution of the national socialists. For this they received the praise of Goering. But the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" erred in speaking of a repetition of August 4th. No, the German Communist Party is at its post. The United National Front lacks a mere "trifle," the revolutionary workers!

At the same time the French and Belgian socialists are openly joining the side of French imperialism, the British Labourites are supporting the policy of the "National" Government; the Czech Social-Democrats are participating in the Coalition Government which has prepared and carried out the reorganisation of the Little Entente, while the Polish Socialist Party gives its unqualified support to the struggle of Polish fascism against German fascism.

During the first imperialist war, the parties of the Second International joined their imperialist bourgeoisie as soon as the war was declared. At the present time the parties of the Second International are supporting their imperialist bourgeoisie even before the war.

Hitler's access to power in Germany has unquestionably greatly accelerated the formation of imperialist military-political alliances on the European Continent. French imperialism has reorganised the Little Entente and is enforcing the closest co-operation between the Little Entente, Poland and Rumania. Hitler and Mussolini, on the other hand, are attempting to organise a so-called anti-Versailles bloc. No one can deny that there are the sharpest imperialist contradictions between German and Italian imperialism. Hitler wants to merge Austria with Germany, while Mussolini is resolutely opposed to the Anschluss. German imperialism seeks to secure its hegemony in the valley of the Danube, while Italian imperialism is anxious to establish its own hegemony on the Danube. German imperialism seeks to penetrate the Balkans, while Italian imperialism regards the Balkans as its own sphere of

influence. Italian and German imperialism are divided by various imperialist contradictions, but are united by the struggle against the hegemony of French imperialism on the European Continent. French imperialism seeks to preserve and strengthen the Versailles partition of the world; German and Italian imperialism seek to achieve a new partition of the world.

Italian imperialism has already taken fascist Hungary in tow, and is attempting to bring Bulgaria and Greece within its system of military-political alliances and split Rumania away from the French bloc.

The extreme instability of the entire international situation finds an expression also in the great instability of the imperialist groupings. The law of uneven development acts here with special force. But the tendency towards the formation of imperialist groupings opposing each other paves its way. And inasmuch as the camp of the imperialist Powers is splitting up into allied groupings opposing each other, the Second International is also splitting up. The lackey follows his master. The Second International reflects those groupings and regroupings which are taking place in the camp of international imperialism. Hence the acceleration of the disintegration of the Second International, hence also the rapid exodus of the Social-Democratic working masses from the parties of the Second International. The united front manoeuvres, carried out this time, not by the Second International as a whole, but by groupings of individual Social-Democratic parties following the same imperialist orientation, reflect, in a certain measure, the real processes of the departure of the masses from the parties of the Second International. These manoeuvres are designed to hinder the desertion of the working masses from the parties of the Second International.

German, Italian and Hungarian fascism seek to utilise the great hatred of the masses for Versailles to mobilise them for a new imperialist war. They have advanced the slogan of a revision of Versailles. *The slogan of a revision, coming from fascists, serves merely as a disguise for the preparation of imperialist war and intervention for a new partition of the world, for a re-division of the spoils.*

German social-fascism openly supports Hitler in his manoeuvres.

French imperialism seeks to utilise the deep hatred for fascism in its struggle for the preservation and consolidation of the Versailles division of the world. It acts under the cover of the slogan of democracy, of a struggle against fascism, with a view to preserving and consolidating the Versailles division of the world. "French democracy" carries on a struggle against German and Italian fascism in an alliance with Polish fascism, with the military-fascist dictatorships of Jugo-Slavia and Rumania.

French social-fascism openly supports French imperialism in these manoeuvres.

German, Italian and Hungarian fascism seek to create a united national front, to poison the petty-bourgeoisie, the peasantry and a section of the workers with the spirit of chauvinism, under cover of the slogan of a struggle against the hated Versailles. French imperialism seeks to create a united Versailles front under the slogan of a struggle against hated fascism in Germany and Italy. Both these slogans merely conceal their imperialist interests, both these slogans cover up the preparation for a new imperialist war.

The revolutionary proletariat conducts a fight against fascism, against Versailles, for the abolition of the system of imperialist divisions and re-divisions, the self-determination of the nations up to separation as an independent State, for the conversion of imperialist war into civil war.

Austro-Marxism advises the U.S.S.R. to conclude an alliance with the "great democracies" on an international scale to fight fascism. Austro-Marxism and French, Polish, Czech and Belgian social-fascism advise the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. to conclude an alliance with "democratic" France and her vassals against German and Italian fascism. This group of social-fascists pretends to forget that there is such a thing as French, British and American imperialism. The task of the first proletarian State in the world consists not in the preservation and consolidation of the Versailles division of the world. The U.S.S.R. will continue her independent proletarian policy, which does not consist either in supporting the Versailles division, or the struggle for a new imperialist re-division of the world. It consists in a struggle against imperialist war and military intervention, for peace. The revolutionary proletariat does not support either the German-Italian, or the French bloc; but fights against both.

German social-fascism had supported Brüning, had voted for Hindenburg in order later to appear in support of Hitler's foreign policy.

To French social-fascism, the French general staff is the supreme authority in the struggle against fascism. The Austrian social-fascists await the salvation of democracy by Dollfuss, Benes, King Alexander and the French general staff. These gentlemen cannot even imagine that an independent proletarian policy can exist also in international relations. This independent proletarian policy is being pursued by the Communist Parties.

While the straining of imperialist contradictions in Europe has reached white heat, in the Far East events are also moving at increased speed. Japanese imperialism continues to pursue the policy of imperialist conquest and the Kuomintang does not resist. The Nanking Government of national disgrace and treachery still hypocritically continues

to talk of resistance. But the "left" Wang Ching-wei has already issued the slogan of "resistance and negotiations," resistance in words and capitulation in reality. Resistance in words to Japanese imperialism, capitulation in reality, accompanied by attempts to provoke a war between the U.S.S.R. and Japanese imperialism to improve its position in the negotiations with Japanese imperialism, and serve American imperialism in good stead.

The Kuomintang and its generals laid down arms when Japanese imperialism captured Manchuria in September, 1931. The Kuomintang and its War Minister, Chang-Kai-shek sabotaged the heroic fight for Shanghai. The Kuomintang surrendered Jehol to Japanese imperialism without a fight. The Kuomintang surrendered Chahar to Japanese imperialism, the Kuomintang opened the gates of Peking and Tientsin before Japanese imperialism. And the same Kuomintang wants to provoke a war between Japan and the U.S.S.R. over the Chinese-Eastern Railway.

And the parties of the Second International help the Kuomintang when they oppose the Soviet Government's offer to sell the Chinese-Eastern Railway. These gentlemen cannot conceive of the existence of an independent proletarian policy on the part of the proletarian State, which is expressed in the struggle of the U.S.S.R. for peace, in an attempt to stave off or prevent, on the basis of the principles of Soviet policy, the imperialist pacts against the U.S.S.R., to ensure a breathing space for socialist construction to encircle herself with sympathetic workers and peasants of the whole world.

But while Japanese imperialism widens its conquests, American imperialism also adopts a more active policy. Roosevelt seeks to isolate Japan, split France away from her, and paralyse the British imperialist support of Japan. It is hardly possible to interpret the readiness of the United States to participate in a consultative pact in any other way. Roosevelt seems to have promised Herriot the support of American imperialism in the struggle for the preservation of the Versailles division, should French imperialism support the United States in its struggle against Japanese imperialism, in the struggle for the preservation of the Washington division in the Pacific.

While the knot of imperialist contradictions is becoming tighter and tighter in Europe and the Far East and in the Pacific, the struggle between the leading imperialist Powers, the United States and England, is also passing into a new phase.

The devaluation of the dollar marks a most important step in the deepening of the contradictions between England and the United States, in the struggle for markets between them, in the struggle for sources of raw materials and economic territories. The customs war, the economic war, the struggle for

a redistribution of the gold, in which England incidentally has gained important successes, is now being supplemented by an exchange war. England seeks to take advantage of the increase of the contradictions between Europe and the United States to consolidate her positions in the Pacific. England seeks to take advantage of the split of imperialist Europe into two opposing camps in the interests of British imperialism. British imperialism has taken over the rôle of leader and organiser of the anti-Soviet intervention. In China, in South America, British imperialism is waging a struggle against American imperialism, and attempting to create better positions for the fight against American imperialism both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific. But at the same time British imperialism seeks to defer the outbreak of war in the camp of imperialists by the provocation of an anti-Soviet war.

The World Economic Conference, in view of these circumstances, is foredoomed to failure. It will play the same rôle in the economic field as the Geneva Conference in that of armaments. It will give a fresh impetus to the sharpening of the economic war just as Geneva has given a new one to the race for armaments.

That is why the knot of imperialist contradictions

is becoming tighter and tighter also in the relations between the United States and England.

A peaceful revision is impossible under conditions of imperialism. The relationship of forces in the camp of the imperialists has changed, and force alone solves the problem of a re-division of the world under conditions of imperialism.

Disarmament is possible only in the event of the victory of the revolution, just as the peaceful revision of the treaties dividing the world will be possible only as a result of the victory of the proletarian revolution. Maintenance of the *status quo*? Marx has taught us that the maintenance of the *status quo* is as "real" a task as the "preservation of a dead horse from decomposition." The Versailles-Washington division has become antiquated. It is now a question of a re-division of the world by military force.

The transition to a new series of wars and interventions is accelerating. The Communists, in arming the masses, under these conditions with the theory, strategy and tactics of Leninism, fight *against imperialist war and military intervention, prepare the masses for the conversion of imperialist war and military intervention into a civil war against the bourgeoisie, into a revolutionary war against imperialism.*

POLITICAL LESSONS OF THE FIRST OF MAY

ON the eve of the First of May two manifestoes were issued: one in the name of the E.C.C.I.* and the other in the name of the Second International.

The E.C.C.I. called the international proletariat to mobilise its forces for the struggle against capitalism to demonstrate its militant strength. The bureau of the Second International at a time when the Second International is already beginning to fall apart, as during the war, according to the imperialistic groupings, assures the working masses of its mythical faith in the principle of international proletarian solidarity, and phrasemongering about "socialism" not only detracts the masses from the struggle against capitalism, but tries to frighten them with that struggle.

The manifesto of the E.C.C.I. deals with the growth of political reaction, and the debauch of fascist terror. At the same time it states that "the revolutionary upsurge is steadily growing" that "the ground is shaking under the capitalists," that "in the naval mutinies, in the victories of the Red Army in China, capitalist reaction feels the rumblings of the approaching revolutionary outburst." The proclamation of the Second International does not

say a word about revolutionary upsurge, but only complains that "German fascism is triumphing," that "the working class is suffering a defeat," and consoles its readers with such phrases as "the workers are full of hopes (!) for the re-establishment (!) of their fighting strength and confidence in victory." "What is a Philistine?—an empty gut full of fear and hope." (Was ist ein Philister?—ein hohler Darm voll Furcht und Hoffnung.—Heine.)

The manifesto of the E.C.C.I. called for definite militant measures (mass strikes, meetings, demonstrations, etc.) "against the fascist terror in Germany," against the "robbery of the Japanese imperialists in the Far East, against the preparation for a new imperialistic war, and above all, a war against the Soviet Union, organised by the English diehards," etc. The bureau of the Second International does not call to any concrete action and carefully conceals the names of the Western European war-mongers seeking strife and intervention (most likely so as not to offend the relatives).

The manifesto of the E.C.C.I. calls upon the workers to establish a united revolutionary front in the struggle and unmasks the Social-Democrats who disrupted and are disrupting this united front, who prepared for Hitler's advent to power by their treachery and aided the growth of fascism in other

* "Daily Worker," April 29th.

countries. The proclamation of the Second International maintains silence on the delicate question: Who is to blame for the advent of fascism to power? and says not one word about the united revolutionary front in the struggle against fascism.

The proclamation of the E.C.C.I. puts forward concrete militant slogans, mobilising the worker and peasant masses for the struggle against the bourgeoisie. Dealing with the forty-hour week, it adds: "without wage-cuts"; on social insurance, it adds "at the expense of the capitalists," etc. The proclamation of the bureau of the Second International in its slogans eliminates all elements of the class struggle. It speaks about "adequate help for the victims of the capitalist crisis," but does not say at whose expense; it speaks about the "international" introduction of the forty-hour week, but says nothing about the retention of wages, nor about the possibility of its introduction on a national scale.

The proclamation of the E.C.C.I. speaks about the final revolutionary aims of the struggle. It says about the proletarian revolution "there cannot be a genuine unity of the working class without a struggle for the forcible overthrow of the whole existing capitalist order, for the establishment of the workers' dictatorship." The proclamation of the Second International speaks not of the proletarian revolution but of the "defence of democracy," about the overthrow of the capitalist economy, in avoiding the main question of power, it talks the same "socialism" that Hitler now does.

* * *

These two First of May proclamations showed what would be the alignment of forces on that day: on one side of the barricades there would be the united front of the proletariat led by the Communist Parties, on the other—the united front of the joint forces of the bourgeoisie with its Social-Democratic agency among the working class. Such an alignment of forces has taken place in the last few years on the First of May. But the internal composition of the two enemy camps and the corresponding strength of their forces has changed in connection with the extreme aggravations of all the contradictions of the preceding year. During this year, the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. has gained an historical world victory in completing the Five-Year Plan in four years, whereas in capitalist countries the crisis has deepened, unemployment has grown, the political reaction has become stronger, in Germany Hitler has come to power, Japanese imperialism has extended its military attack on China, the danger of an imperialistic war in connection with Hitler's coming to power has become greater, the danger of intervention in the U.S.S.R. because of the latter, and the actions of the English diehards, as well as the offensive of Japan, have become more imminent. In accordance with this,

the indignation of the masses has grown; and the deep revolutionary fermentation among the toilers all over the world has become more acute.

All this left its mark on the recent First of May. *The same two fronts as last year stand face to face. But the united revolutionary front of the proletariat has broadened and the arising of the proletariat in certain countries (as, for example, in Poland) has assumed a more militant character.* On the other hand, the disintegration in the ranks of the Social-Democrats has increased, as well as the open offensive of fascism.

As last year, the bourgeoisie mobilised all its military and police force, on the First of May, against the revolutionary proletariat. But this time they went much further. Communist demonstrations are now prohibited all over Central Europe, the Communist Party in Czecho-Slovakia is facing the threat of suppression, while in Austria that same possibility is immediate. Also in Austria, unlike last year, or all preceding years, on the First of May, the bourgeois section of Vienna up to the Ring, was surrounded with barbed wire and all processions prohibited in the kingdom of the rich.

In Germany, the Hitler Government topped its mad fascist terror with an unheard-of-in-history impudent dramatisation of the forced celebration of the First of May as "a national holiday of German labour" as a symbol of the liquidation of the class struggle, and its full solution in the bourgeois German nation. To demonstrate the sudden achievement of "national unity" in the "third empire," which threw tens of thousands of workers into prison and murdered hundreds, the National Socialist cells, on the day before the First of May, circulated notices in the factories declaring: "It is the duty of every organised and unorganised worker without exception to take part in the coming celebration on this day. The chairman of the factory committee will make a list of all those who do not participate. Those who do not attend the celebration will be branded as members of the International and enemies of German labour and renaissance of our nation." (Vienna "Arbeiter Zeitung," April 30th.)

On the day of their "national celebration" the bloody buffoon Hitler promised to inform the world what he intends to fulfil in the first year of the German "four-year plan." What did we actually learn from him? That in Germany for seventy years there has raged the "insane idea of the class struggle," that it is time to put an end to it, but, as Hitler admits, it is not so easy to do this in the course of several weeks, or months, or even years. Further, we learned from him, that from now on, every kind of labour, including the "labour" of the capitalists as well (the "labour" of clipping coupons) would be equally honoured. To a million workers, dying from hunger and unemployment, he promises instead of

bread, "honour." "The fact that millions in our midst, from year to year, are painstakingly working without any hope of becoming rich, or even achieving a life of ease, must oblige us to respect those millions all the more." To illustrate what honour those millions will receive in the reign of the "third empire," the organisers of the First of May national celebration decided, that the people would be admitted to the parade square by differently priced tickets, and the more one paid, the nearer would he sit or stand to the "leader" Hitler.

The bloody buffoon further declared that this respect for labour would find its expression in the establishment of a *forced labour service*; that is, actually compelling practically unpaid work for the landlord and the capitalist, and a forced training of the unemployed as cannon fodder. And, finally, the perspectives Hitler offers to the toiling masses who, under the dictatorship of the proletariat become conscious builders of socialism on the basis of proletarian democracy, we can judge from the following from the "leader": "It is necessary to free creative initiative from the fateful influence of the decision of the majority. Not only in Parliament, but also in economics, the decision of the majority is not the result of intelligence but of foolishness, weakness and cowardice."

Hitler, much against his will, could not avoid an answer to the cursed question as to how he intends to draw the masses, even if they are "stupid," out of the degradation and unemployment. But on this burning question he could only say the following: "We must begin from the 'roots,' from the bettering of the situation of the peasants, from the bettering of the situation of the farm owners." Further, for the liquidation of unemployment, it will be necessary to repair and build new houses, and construct new roads (but where will the money be found?). And, finally, unemployment, he said, can be liquidated only by the diligence and application of all members of the "nation": "Every entrepreneur, every house-owner, every merchant, every separate person, is obliged according to his own personal wealth, to assist in the finding of work, and, above all, every separate person is obliged to remember what German work means." ("Berliner Borsen Zeitung," May 2nd). Truly a great discovery of a national genius! In this manner, as was to be expected, the mountain gave birth to a mouse. The bloody hangman Hitler, in his long-awaited "programme" speech, indicated to the proletariat that it could expect, in the future, from the Hitler régime instead of bread and work—bullets.

* * *

How did the international Social-Democrats react on this First of May to this outburst of fascism? They reacted in that they prohibited the members of their party from taking part in the united front

struggle against fascism in conjunction with the Communists. They reacted in that—in some cases—they refused to organise the proletarian celebration on the day of the First of May, postponing it to a non-working day, so as not to infringe the interests of capitalist production; in other cases, they falsified the militant celebration; and, finally, in still other cases, they joined in the fascist First of May comedy. In England, the Labour Party and trade unions postponed the celebration to the Seventh of May (a non-working day). In Austria, where fascism is attacking frantically and the establishment of the open fascist dictatorship, like its German model, is possible in the nearest future, the Social-Democrats, following in the footsteps of their brother party in Germany, fully capitulated to the fascist bourgeoisie, conceding meekly and resignedly to all its demands, and at the same time tried to mesmerise the workers into believing that this very capitulation is "the road to victory."

The Dolfuss Government prohibited the cessation of work on the trams on the First of May. The Communists, despite this decree, called for the stoppage of work; the Social-Democrats called upon the workers to obey the demands of the Government, and hastened to announce that the leaflets, calling for the cessation of work, did not issue from them, but from the Communists, which the latter willingly conceded, despite the threats of suppression of the Communist Party. The Dolfuss Government prohibited the workers of Vienna from penetrating beyond the Ring separating the wealthy districts from the workers' quarters, and in general prohibited the organisation of any demonstrations. The Social-Democrats resigned themselves to this and in their own proclamation invited the workers to organise a "walk" instead of a demonstration. "We shall walk along certain streets, not in the road but on the pavement; we shall make no outcries; we shall not sing; we shall avoid everything that can possibly cause any conflict with the police." And so they did. According to their instructions, the Social-Democratic workers not only confined themselves to walking on the pavement, but did not even walk in columns, but as ordinary strolling pedestrians, and when they approached the prohibited Ring, the Social-Democratic functionaries pushed them back, provoking the protests of the workers who exclaimed that the functionaries took upon themselves voluntarily the rôle of "deputy police." And after this, the Social-Democrat bourgomeister Seitz in the Stadium, declared self complacently: "From to-day's events the gentlemen should derive the following lesson, that in applying the use of force, machine-guns, cavalry, barbed wire barricades, one can lose the battle and be disgraced," and the Social-Democrat "Arbeiter Zeitung" chortled, "They (the workers) in this First of May 'walk' exposed the uselessness

and meaninglessness of the parade of military strength against their peaceful demonstration." The "Arbeiter Zeitung" was hardly aware of the fact that it was ridiculing itself and its Central Committee; if the Austrian bourgeoisie had only such "enemies" as the leadership of the Austrian Social-Democrats to contend with and not the working masses and the Communists, it would be decidedly "useless and meaningless" to plant machine guns in the streets. What master would open fire on sparrows with artillery, and direct arms against his own obedient lackey?

The actions of the Austrian Social-Democrats of the First of May aped the actions of the Social-Democrats of Germany of yesterday, the actions of the German Social-Democrats of to-day found clear expression in the proclamation issued on 22nd April by the committee of the German Free Trade Unions and printed in the "Gewerkschafts Zeitung": "The executive committee of the A.D.G.B. issued the following decree: The executive committee of the A.D.G.B. greets the First of May as a legalised holiday of our national labour and calls upon the members of the trade unions in full consciousness of their pioneer service to the idea of the First of May as regards the respect due to creative labour and the inclusion with full equality of the working class into the State, everywhere to triumphantly participate in the celebration organised by the Government." It required only to conclude the resolution instead of the old words: "Workers of the world, unite!" with the new words: "Heil Hitler!" ("Long Live Hitler"). Even though these words were not literally expressed, they completely correspond to the meaning and contents of the treacherous resolution of the directorate of the A.D.G.B.

* * *

International Social-Democracy did everything in their power to aid the bourgeoisie liquidate the militant activities of the proletariat on the First of May. But all their efforts were in vain. The Comintern succeeded this year, in a greater measure than all previous years, in developing the revolutionary united front of the proletariat on this day.

In Germany, despite the threats of the fascists to declare every worker not participating in the Hitler comedy as an enemy of the German nation, by means of a personal check-up with the clearly understood consequences, despite the call of the E.C. of the reformist trade unions to take part in this comedy, the workers of the mills and factories boycotted it. For the very reason, that the reformist trade union leaders, despite all their efforts, did not succeed in drawing the organised industrial workers into the Hitler front on the First of May, the fascists, on the day following the demonstration, arrested all the forty leaders of the reformist trade unions, including the arch-traitor Leipart, as good-for-nothings,

unnecessary for fascism, in so far as they had evidently lost their influence on the working masses. As far as concerns the German Communists, despite the unheard-of terror, they did not limit themselves to organising a boycott of the fascist national celebration. They, despite this terror, made attempts at an open revolutionary action. Before the First of May Communist leaflets were distributed calling for revolutionary demonstrations and support of the Communist Party. On 29th April, at nine o'clock in the morning, in Berlin, in the Frankfurter Allee, thousands of Communist leaflets were distributed. They were also handed out in department stores, and in Neuköln they were even brought into the houses. On the First of May, in East Berlin, on Strassmannstrasse, at ten o'clock in the morning, the Communists organised a street demonstration in which several hundred workers participated, shouting revolutionary slogans and singing the "International." The demonstration was disbanded before the advent of the police. On the 2nd May in Gamboorn, two pits went on strike in answer to the fascist terror. On 3rd May, in many industrial districts of the Ruhr, Saxony, and Berlin, "Italian" (stay-in) strikes were carried out.

In England, the Communist Party, which had already ten days before the First of May, extended the united front movement with the Independent Labour Party which had withdrawn from the Second International; against the embargo on Soviet imports, in conjunction with this same Independent Labour Party organised huge meetings in London on the First of May in Hyde Park, and in Glasgow, under the slogans: "United front against war, against fascism, against intervention in the Soviet Union!" The meeting in Hyde Park after the demonstration was attended by 20,000 people; in Glasgow a demonstration of 15,000 to Glasgow Green grew to 50,000.

In France, in Paris, in the forest of Vincennes, the Communist Party organised a meeting of 70,000, under the slogan of the united front struggle. After the meeting thousands of workers, despite the prohibitions of the police, returned to Paris in closed ranks. This demonstration engaged in actual fights with the police, the result of which was many wounded. Strong demonstrations and strikes of short duration took place in many towns in France. In Marseilles, 10,000 workers demonstrated; 4,000 in Alaise; in Nîmes, great demonstrations took place before the prison; 3,000 people took part in the demonstration in Nice; in Liétard, 6,000; in Calais, 2,000 to 2,500; in Lyons, 3,000, etc.

In Brussels, the demonstration tore the flag from the German Embassy. In Amsterdam, the Communist and Social-Democratic workers organised huge demonstrations before the German Consulate. A large number of police were helpless to disperse

the anti-fascist demonstration, organised by the Communist Party; several German Nazis were beaten up in the streets, more than forty fascists were wounded. In Lüttich, the demonstrators tore the fascist banner from the German Consulate and broke the windows. In Spain, in Madrid and in other towns, general strikes occurred. In Seville, at the funeral of the Communist Ferrera, who was treacherously killed by the anarchists, 5,000 workers, agricultural workers and poor peasants took part.

In Switzerland, in Zurich, 3,000 workers marched in the Communist demonstration, and 5,000 workers were present at the Communist meeting. According to the testimony of the bourgeois press, the comparison of the Communist and the Social-Democrat demonstrations in Zurich, this year and previous years, showed the victory of the Communist Party. In Basle, the stronghold of the Social-Democrat leader, Robert Grimm, 3,500 workers took part in the Communist demonstration, and 1,200—one-third as many—in the Social-Democrat demonstration. In Berne, the Communists succeeded in organising a demonstration of a thousand people for the first time. In Schaffhausen, there were 1,300 workers who paraded—Communists, Social-Democrats and ex-Communists. At the conference on the united front, the Communists sharply criticised the Social-Democrats in their speeches. In Geneva, the Communist demonstration was prohibited after the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Party, from their side, prevented the organisation of a united front with the Communists. However, a general meeting of the Communists and the left Social-Democrats took place at the tombs of the victims of the Geneva slaughter, at which, besides two Communist orators, the left Social-Democrat Erler made a speech.

In Czecho-Slovakia, according to the Czecho-Slovakian paper, "Vorwärts," "The May action of the Communist Party was well attended, more militant, more powerful and more enthusiastic than last year." Despite the fact that the Social-Democrat leaders made speeches against the establishment of the united front, trying to prevent it, in the small towns the Social-Democratic workers demonstrated together with the Communists; while in the large ones, every time a Communist demonstration met the Social-Democrats, the latter warmly greeted the Communists ("Vorwärts" from May 3rd issue). In Prague, the demonstration of the Communists was more powerful than the combined demonstrations of the Czech Social-Democrats, and German Socialists. In Reichenberg, despite the rain, 3,000 workers took part. In Beyscheterplatz, from 7,000 to 8,000; in Brüx, 7,000; in Northern Bohemia more than 35,000; in Komotau, 3,000; in Slovakia, in Nitre, 5,000; in Bratislav, 5,000; in Keshmarok, 1,800; in Leutchenek, 2,000; in Kladno, 8,000, etc.

In Austria, on the First of May, our not very large party succeeded in stirring up the peaceful walk of the Social-Democrats and disturbing their holiday calm. In Vienna, on the Taborstrasse, the expected peaceful "walk" was turned into a militant demonstration of the Red United Front. Despite the exhortations of the Social-Democratic functionaries, the enormous street was gradually filled with cries of "Down with Dolfuss! Down with Fay! Join in the united Red front!" But a less open discussion took place also during the demonstration. To the shouts of the Communists, "Rot Front!" the Social-Democrats answered "For Freedom!" The Social-Democrats shouted "Disperse!" the Communists shouted, "Onward, further!" Despite the attempts to disband the demonstration after eleven o'clock it continued for some time longer. In Marie-Gelferstrasse, workers beat up the National Socialists. To avoid any further difficulties the police urged the Nazis to clear out.

The demonstrations in the U.S.A. were of very large proportions. On Union Square, according to official figures, more than 100,000 people gathered, and according to the united front committee more than 150,000. The Social-Democratic leaders urged the demonstrators to disperse before the arrival of the Red demonstration for a united front. Despite that, many Social-Democrat workers remained and took part in the revolutionary demonstration, under militant slogans. In Chicago, 35,000 participated and 50,000 workers attended a mass meeting. In the realm of the automobile king Ford, in Detroit, 50,000 demonstrated under the leadership of the Communists.

In Japan, our heroic Communist Party succeeded in arranging anti-war demonstrations in many towns. In Tokio, 4,000 workers demonstrated, despite the fact that large numbers of the police had been posted on the streets. In Tokio, and also in Asaki, clashes with the police occurred. Hundreds of workers were arrested. In Kobe, more than 1,000 workers took part in the demonstration. The sailors on the boats in the harbour, held a series of meetings. This was the first occurrence of its kind in the history of the First of May in Japan. More than 1,500 workers demonstrated in Nagore, twice as many as last year.

* * *

The strikes, meetings and demonstrations in Poland assumed decidedly exceptional dimensions and a clearly revolutionary character. In Warsaw, the main factories ceased work. Practically, all the central railroad workshops and munition factories went on strike. In many places where revolutionary meetings were held, vicious attacks by the police followed. In Warsaw, in the suburb Praga, a revolutionary demonstration of 1,000 workers marching with placards and banners took place.

The revolutionary trade union opposition of the food workers organised a meeting in which 2,000 took part. There, as everywhere, clashes with the police took place. The Communist deputies of the Diet displayed model revolutionary grit. On Dlugozy Street, the Communist deputy, Rojek, made a speech. The police were unable to hold back the revolutionary workers attempting to reach the centre of the city. At twelve o'clock 1,000 workers gathered at the corner of Orla Street where Rojek again spoke. After the meeting the workers, with banners of the Central Committee of the Communist Party unfurled, broke through the police cordon. When this demonstration was dispersed, a new one formed at once. In the suburb of Praga, the revolutionary workers drew into their ranks several hundred Social-Democratic workers. On the Gensy Street, the police fired on the crowd; however, the workers' action did not stop until late in the evening. On Glibovsky Street at a meeting of 1,500, deputy Rojek spoke for the third time. Two thousand mobilised police were unable to withhold the mass outpouring of the workers. In the Dombrovsky Basin, strikes spread to most of the plants. There also demonstrations and clashes with the police took place, and there also the workers broke through the police cordons. In Sosnovetz, Communist deputy Ignasek spoke, leading the demonstration, which lasted three hours. In Lodz, besides many well-attended Communist mass meetings, large Communist demonstrations were held. Communist workers, under the leadership of the Communist deputy Rosenberg, went in advance of the Social-fascist procession and drew the masses to their side. Rosenberg was mishandled by the police, and although battered, spoke at a later meeting in Dvoborshik Street. In Upper Silesia, in many towns, thousands of demonstrations were dispersed by the police.

Throughout the entire capitalist world and in countless cities, the proletariat, ignoring police and fascist terror, under the leadership of the Communist Party, displayed on the First of May its will to the struggle and victory. But by far the most magnificent character was assumed by the First of May demonstration in the Soviet Union. In the Red capital, in Moscow, one-and-a-half million workers marched. Here the workers demonstrated in their own fatherland, in the fatherland of the international proletariat. Here the Red Army raised its bayonets in opposition to those of the capitalist countries, against the enemies of the working class, but, however, it would have been quite incorrect to think that in Moscow and many towns of the Soviet Union, the First of May demonstration bore the peaceful character of a tranquil holiday, of a calm promenade. The workers of all plants and factories displayed their tremendous achievements in the work of socialist construction with countless

placards. Their achievements were not only the fruit of the heroic enthusiasm of labour, they were also the fruit of the enduring class struggle with the beaten but not yet eliminated class enemy. The workers here demonstrated not only their achievements, but also the militant obligations they have assumed in the first year of the second Five-Year Plan.

A powerful impression was produced by the First of May parade of the Red Army, which confirmed the words of Comrade Stalin, that the fast tempo of the Five-Year Plan guaranteed the defensive power of the Soviet Union. The Red Army, in contrast to the armies of all capitalist countries, has no intention of attacking anyone, but only stands on guard at the Soviet borders. But the defence of the Soviet Union is the defence of the fatherland of the world proletariat, the defence of the main bulwark of the world revolution, and the Red Army is not only aware of this but fully infused with enormous enthusiasm. Comrade Blücher commanding the Far East Army, finishing his speech at the meeting in Kharbarovsk, said: "The iron fist to those who dare to seize not only one single acre of our soil, but even one single Soviet tractor." "Permit me in the name of the Revolutionary Military Council, all Red Army men and Red sailors, in the name of all those who stand here under arms, to assure the toiling masses of the U.S.S.R. and through them the proletariat of all countries *that the Red Army is ready to fight for the world proletarian revolution, at any given moment is ready to defend the October conquests.*"

* * *

What lessons can we derive from the First of May revolutionary review of the strength of the international proletariat?

Lesson 1.—The international bourgeoisie trying to find a way out of the crisis, in the suppression of the proletarian revolutionary movement, in the waging of imperialistic war, in intervention against the Soviet Union, is resorting more and more not only to repression, force, terror, political banditry, but also is striving to kill in the proletariat the feeling of class solidarity and infect it with a bestial nationalism and chauvinism. The proletariat's answer to this is the growth of revolutionary enthusiasm, the strengthening of international solidarity, the strengthening of the struggle against imperialistic war, intervention against the U.S.S.R., and the struggle for the defence of the U.S.S.R.

Lesson 2.—International Social-Democracy, displaying itself as the most faithful guardian of the bourgeoisie, is not only striving to disarm the proletariat, to paralyse its struggle, but also in the example of its vanguard—the Social-Democrats of Germany—has already joined hands with the open fascist dictatorship, and enlisted in the camp of frenzied nationalism. The proletariat in answer to

that is more and more deserting the Social-Democrats.

Lesson 3.—The international united revolutionary front of the struggle is growing and spreading under the leadership of the Communist Party. Our task is to spread the united revolutionary front of the struggle with the bourgeoisie wider and wider, liquidating the influence of the treacherous Social-Democrats on the working masses, winning over the majority of the working class to the side of our revolutionary slogans and our revolutionary purposes.

Lesson 4.—We have to plant in the consciousness

of the masses deeper than is now being done, that we have approached a new round of revolutions and wars, that we are drawing closer to the decisive class battles, to the battles for power, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that for victory in these battles, the workers in the capitalist world must show the same firmness, the same heroism, the same self-denial, the same solidarity to its only party, the Communist Party, which the workers of the former Tsarist Russia have shown and are showing in their great October victory and their present triumphant construction of socialism.

THE INTERVENTIONIST CAMPAIGN OF THE DIEHARDS AND PROLETARIAN RESISTANCE IN ENGLAND

BY PAT DEVINE

THE frantic drive of British imperialism to stem the tide of deepening economic crisis is clearly reflected in the many open and secret steps taken against the Soviet Union, especially during the past months and sharply brings to the forefront the tremendous importance of a speedy proletarian resistance in the form of a powerful anti-war movement.

Imperialist Great Britain has most painfully experienced the shock of the disintegration and decay of capitalist economy, and is witnessing with great alarm and hatred the successes of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, which, after triumphantly achieving the first Five-Year Plan in four years, is now enthusiastically and energetically engaged in the second Five-Year Plan of the building of a classless socialist society.

The contradictions of the two worlds, seen in the advance of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the steady increase in unemployment and decrease in the export trade of Britain, the manifold colonial revolts in China and India, together with the sharp capitalist antagonisms in the struggle for markets are the driving forces behind the aggressive interventionist policy of the British diehards.

Since the early days, when the arch-imperialist Churchill poured £100 millions into the lap of the counter-revolutionary armies fighting against the Soviets, up to the present time Britain has maintained a consistent anti-Soviet policy varying only in intensity when political expediency demands it. The leading rôle of Britain for aggression against the U.S.S.R. has shown itself in recent months in the following concrete instances:—

1. Support of the Japanese occupation of Manchuria, the attack on China, and the preparation

of Japanese imperialism for a new war against the first workers' republic.

2. The proposed Four Western Powers Pact of France, Britain, Italy and Germany.

3. Breaking of the trade agreement.

4. The embargo on Soviet goods in connection with the trial of the Metro-Vickers engineers for wrecking and spying activities on electric stations of the U.S.S.R.

SUPPORT FOR JAPANESE INTERVENTION.

In the Far East Great Britain has supported Japan in every possible way. At the most critical period when Japan could obviously go no farther without guarantees of support, Sir John Simon, Foreign Secretary in the British Government, has made the requisite declarations giving Japan grounds by their very vagueness, to continue its pillaging attack.

During the farcical League of Nations discussion on Japanese occupation of North China, Simon confined himself to wordy abstract legal talk, while thousands of Chinese were being massacred by Japanese bombs. Simultaneously, with the farce of Geneva, British passenger ships in splendid sea-going condition were sold to Japan clearly for war purposes, at the same time, shiploads of munitions were sent to the Japanese army.

In February and March this year according to Lt.-Col. Colville, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Overseas Trade, in a statement to Parliament British armament firms sent the following supplies of munitions to the Far East:—

February—20 rifles, 20,000 rifle cartridges, 6,000,000 7.92 mm. rifle cartridges, and equipment for bombers.

March—Armament fittings and equipment for

two aircraft, 67,000 13.3 mm. machine-gun cartridges, 360,000 .303-inch machine-gun cartridges and 6 million 7.92 mm. rifle cartridges. 300 machine guns with spare parts, etc.

Last year the British warships (46 vessels) were standing by at Shanghai, peacefully witnessing Japanese aeroplanes pouring down a rain of deadly bombs on the civil population. When the Japanese occupied Shanghai, the British ships exchanged friendly salutes with their murder cruisers under the pretext of "protecting" British lives. There were three British residents at Shanghai at that time.

After months of interminable discussion and formulas, the League of Nations ultimately agreed to the Chinese contention that Japan was "unlawfully resorting to war." According to Article 6 of the Covenant, China was entitled to the "moral support of every nation adhering to the League." After that Japan left the League.

Then, with traditional British hypocrisy and demagoguery Sir John Simon introduced an arms embargo on the shipment of munitions to both Japan and China.

To complete the farce, the arms embargo was withdrawn within a week and Japan, League of Nations censure notwithstanding, continued its war campaign with renewed vigour.

Arthur Henderson, British Labour Party leader, as chairman of the Disarmament Conference said, "If the League fails in Asia it will be fatally weakened for use in Europe." It did fail. But the Labour Party, in line with social-democracy the world over, merely intensified its efforts to prevent the subsequent disillusionment from consolidating itself into a powerful movement for defence of China and the Soviet Union. The Labour Party leader well deserved the £2,000 Peace Prize recently granted him for services in the cause of "World Peace" by a grateful imperialist world.

The clue to the explanation of the uninterrupted and firm British support to Japan can be seen, *first of all*, in the aggressive policy of Japanese imperialism towards the U.S.S.R. In January of this year, General Araki, Japanese War Minister, made the following revealing statement:—

"I am an opponent of the attempt of Russia to Sovietise the world . . . as far as I am concerned, I am in favour of an active (war.—P.D.) policy against Russia, so long as she does not abandon Communism."

The influential London "Daily Telegraph," at about the same time, said: "Japan is our old and tried friend and former ally, who is rightly regarded as the main bulwark against Bolshevism in the Far East."

So long as Japan conducts a war campaign against Bolshevism in the Far East" Britain is prepared to

stand the "risk" of her many possessions and areas in China and Manchuria.

THE FOUR-POWER PACT.

While maintaining this as her main line in the East, Britain was also attempting to use the aggravation of antagonisms between the U.S.A. and Japan to her advantage. In the West, the diehard National Government with the "Socialist" MacDonald at its head, has been equally active. The acute situation in Europe has increased the tension between the various Powers. At the same time, the American debt question has been a point around which the major debtor Powers could unite and find a common language. In this situation MacDonald has been touring Europe—Geneva—and Rome, where for the first time he met Mussolini. Arising from the various discussions, Britain has evolved the idea of a Four-Power Pact of the chief Western Powers—Germany, France, Italy and Britain. The full text of the pact is as follows:

(a) The four great Western Powers—Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy—undertake to realise among themselves, an effective policy of co-operation with a view to maintaining peace in accordance with the Kellogg and anti-war pacts. They also undertake to act in the domain of European relations in such a manner that this peace policy will be adopted in case of necessity by other Powers as well.

(b) The four Powers confirm the principle of the revision of treaties in accordance with the clauses of the Covenant of the League of Nations in cases in which there is a possibility that they will lead to conflict among the States. They declare, at the same time, that the principle of revision cannot be applied except within the framework of the League and in a spirit of mutual understanding and solidarity of reciprocal interests.

(c) France, Great Britain and Italy declare that, in case the Disarmament Conference reaches only a partial result, the equality of rights recognised for Germany shall have an effective character and Germany undertakes to realise this equality of rights by stages which will be determined by successive agreements among the four Powers through the usual diplomatic channels. The four Powers undertake to reach similar agreements with Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria.

(d) In all political and non-political European and extra-European questions and in the colonial sphere, the four Powers undertake to adopt as far as possible a common line of action.

(e) The present political agreement of understanding and co-operation which will be submitted if necessary for parliamentary approval within three months, will be of ten years duration and automatically extended for another ten years unless

denounced by one of the contracting parties one year before its expiration.

(f) The present pact will be filed with the Secretary of the League of Nations.

Even a most superficial examination of the terms of the pact shows clearly against whom it is first of all directed. The capitalist Press hailed the pact as a renewal of the Locarno spirit of 1925.

Is it an accident that the Rome conversations between MacDonald and Mussolini, from which the pact evolved, took place at the identical time when bloody Hitler, after his rise to power in Germany, was making the most provocative anti-Soviet speeches?

The pact, as a project of the British imperialists, must be a step in the direction of the building of a united front of European Powers against the Soviets, in the pursuit of which the murderous cut-throats of German fascism, fresh from their blood-letting and oppression of the revolutionary German proletariat, will be used.

The pact is of especial significance when it is recognised that all four Powers are heavy debtors to the U.S.A. Germany and France have already defaulted, and whilst Britain and Italy paid their last instalments, they have intimated that they intend paying nothing more under the present conditions. Britain tries to unite Europe against America, and America strenuously endeavours to divide the debtor nations. Britain tries to strengthen German fascism and weaken French hegemony in Europe, while France clings tightly to Versailles.

The new variant of the Four-Power Pact, approved on May 20th, recognised the French theses in reference to the "security" given to German fascism in the matter of revising the Versailles Treaty, just as much as the "famous" resolution adopted at the "conference of the Five Powers" on December 11th, about German "equality" in armaments, which means—absolutely nothing at all.

In the campaign for the final acceptance of the Pact, British imperialism has many things to consider. The French objections to any interference with Versailles, which encountered the keen Italian and German desire for revision, were seemingly insurmountable obstacles. The accomplishment of the Pact would mean for British imperialism the weakening of French hegemony in Europe, without at the same time strengthening the power of Germany and Italy. And at the same time, this would lead, in accordance with the scheme of the English and German initiators of the Pact, to the strengthening of the anti-Soviet bloc.

* * *

The first attempt of the four Powers to formulate the Pact, was frustrated by the resistance of France. But the motives which impelled England, Italy and Germany to put forward this plan were extremely serious. Therefore England refused to "surrender

arms" and vigorously resumed her struggle for the Four-Power Pact.

At the present time, new negotiations of the Four Powers have opened, and the Pact has been agreed to.

There can be no doubt that if four imperialist Powers arrayed in two antagonistic blocs, can conclude a amicable treaty, then that treaty (pact) is directed against a third side, namely—the U.S.S.R.

BREACH OF TRADE AGREEMENT.

Alongside the Four-Power Pact, and as part and parcel of the war manœuvres of Britain against the Soviet Union in the East and in Europe, the diehards have been conducting a frenzied economic trade war. The Ottawa Conference, which was undoubtedly a further stage in the development of Anglo-American antagonisms, had, as its main aim, the striking of a blow at Soviet trade. The Canadian Prime Minister (Bennett) in his first speech at the Conference, said in connection with the U.S.S.R., that—

"A State-controlled standard of living, State-controlled labour, State-aided dumping dictate and stimulated by high State policy, conflict in theory and practice with the free institutions of the British Empire. . . . We must be active in the defence of our institutions."

Despite the drastic consequences to, and the protest of the lumber associations and the workers' action (many of whom were thrown out of a job), the concrete result of Ottawa was the serving of a six months' notice to the Soviet Union by Britain for the termination of the trade agreement; the termination to take place at six months ending April 17th, 1933, the original date for the termination of the agreement. Britain was firmly determined in November, 1932, to abrogate the trade agreement with U.S.S.R.; the only question was how best and painlessly can it be done?

All over the country the working class of Britain raised a vigorous protest against the threatened breach of agreement which they correctly recognised as meaning increased unemployment, higher food prices and above all, an attack on the Soviet Union.

TRIAL OF METRO-VICKERS ENGINEER-WRECKERS.

Towards the latter part of the six months notice for the ending of the agreement, the Soviet Union unearthed a criminal conspiracy on the part of a group of Metro-Vickers engineers in Russia who, in conjunction with a number of Russian engineers, were conducting a vicious wrecking sabotage and espionage plot against the workers' Government.

Evidence of the most conclusive character, including the confessions in their own handwriting, was secured against the spies. Without waiting for the trial, Sir Esmond Ovey, British Ambassador in Moscow, supported by the National Government, categorically declared the engineers innocent and

demanding their release, threatening a British embargo on Soviet imports in the event of a refusal. Every capitalist paper from the "Morning Post" to the Labour Party "Daily Herald" carried on a vicious anti-Soviet campaign. The young Tory bloods in the House of Commons demanded that immediate action be taken to "protect British subjects abroad!"

The Soviet Power was not intimidated by these threats, cast aside the British claims to interfere in the carrying out of justice in the Soviet Union, and declared an open trial of the wreckers. British imperialism used the trial to the utmost to make it a tremendous political conflict. The trial is now history and the exhibition of the engineers in the dock—one pleading guilty and the other previously admitting his guilt and then withdrawing his own as well as his colleague's guilt, at the same time stating that during the examination, no forceful measures were used against him was pitiful. At the trial ample proof of their guilt was produced. The trial proved to the world that the Soviets, who had reminded Britain that it was not Mexico she was dealing with (as Comrade Litvinoff curtly indicated to Sir E. Ovey, who happened to be previously Minister to Mexico), but a powerful sovereign State, had allowed working class justice to proceed on its course unaffected by provocative diehard abuse. Despite the fact that the guilt of the accused English engineers was thoroughly proved, despite the fact that the accused admitted that their statements concerning the use of the so-called "third degree" were gross lies, despite the fact that the sentences imposed were the acme of moderation, testifying the strength of the proletarian State, the logical sequence of Britain's anti-Soviet policy was the breaking off of the negotiations for a new trading agreement and the passing of the Embargo Bill. A glance at the whole attitude of Britain towards the U.S.S.R. is sufficient to prove that, despite all the demagoguery at the time about the embargo being a measure initiated in the interests of the Metro engineers, it was merely a continuation of the old English anti-Soviet policy, which is now being strongly intensified, due to the development of Japan's robber attacks, due to the fact that Hitler has taken power, with promises to "save the whole world from Bolshevism," and finally, the necessity of diverting the growing military conflict between imperialist Powers in Europe to the line of intervention against the U.S.S.R.

The Second International, the social-democratic parties of the world and their entire Press, have placed themselves on the side of the criminals and imperialist plotters, against the Soviet State and its revolutionary justice, whenever the U.S.S.R. has found it necessary to punish wreckers and spies. Their record in the Shakhly trial of 1928, the Industrial Party in 1930, the trial of the Menshevik

Interventionists, and now the trial of Metro-Vickers wreckers, are clear evidence of this.

The infamous and impudent telegram sent to the Soviet Union by the T.U.C. and Labour Party Joint Committee is a glaring example of the treachery, imperialist aims and anti-working class character of these higher organs of the British Labour Movement. Not a word about the scoundrels who were trying to weaken the Soviet State, not a word about the spies, no recognition of the freedom of defence allowed the prisoners. No! Merely a repetition of the voice of the National Government.

The T.U.C. and the Labour Party leadership called for the freedom of the wrecker engineers, but did not say a word about the Meerut prisoners who were kept in jail for four years without a trial by the Labour Government of which they themselves were members, as well as by the present National Government.

All this is in strict accord with a statement signed by Citrine, Secretary of the T.U.C., in response to the united front appeal issued by the C.P. of Great Britain, wherein he delivers an airy lecture about being "equally against all dictatorships, whether fascist or Communist."

H. N. Brailsford, leading Labour publicist, in the "Wiener Arbeiter Zeitung" on April 13th, says that in his opinion "the six British engineers were not guilty . . . they are respected men in their professions . . . and it is improbable that men of this type would deliberately destroy their own work."

Continuing he states there is an "entirely innocent explanation" for the technical defects in the work of the engineers, and furthermore, he suggests that the trial merely gave an opportunity for "one of those violent dramatic performances so liked by the Bolshevik police" and therefore "in the hands of the Bolshevik police the assumption arose of international sabotage, because the Russians in their youth played at conspirators as we play at football." He furthermore insinuated that the Soviet Government needed something "to divert attention" from the "collapse of their agricultural collectivisation plan."

In "Reynolds's Illustrated News," official organ of the British Co-operative Movement, Brailsford writes in a similar strain and suggests to the Soviet Union that "she will be wise if she lets these two men go." What she might not yield to Sir John Simon, let us hope she will concede at the request of the Labour Movement."

The Labour betrayers are devoting the major part of their time trying to show their "sound British sense" and do the dirty work of the capitalists. They are not explaining to the workers the real meaning of the Embargo Bill and the breach of the trading agreement and carry out, in practice, the foreign policy of imperialism. By carrying out the line of

imperialist foreign policy, the action of the National Government at the same time, means not only attacks against the Fatherland of the proletariat, but also increased unemployed and higher prices for the workers at home. And here is proved the old Marxist-Leninist maxim that those who betray the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat for its ultimate aims, inevitably betray the daily interests of the workers.

Four-fifths of what U.S.S.R. exports comes under the ban, composed in the main of the following goods: Butter, wheat, barley, oats, maize in grain, poultry and game, raw cotton, petroleum oils, wood, timber, hewn, sawn, planed or dressed, including pit props, pit wood, staves, sleepers and plywood, builders' woodwork, including frames, doors and gates.

Last year Britain imported from Soviet Russia foodstuffs and raw materials to the value of about £19,000,000. The articles affected by the embargo accounted for just under £16,000,000 of that total.

Britain exported to Russia goods amounting to over £9,000,000 (this year it was expected to reach £12,000,000). Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland estimates that for every £1,000,000 spent in Britain by Soviet Russia, between 6,000 to 7,000 workers are employed for a full year. This means that as a direct result of the embargo and the breach of the trading agreement, over 60,000 British workers will be added to the 3,500,000 workers already on the "scrap-heap."

More unemployment with its consequent starvation for millions of men, women and children, such are the results which will be attained by the diehard National Government in its forlorn efforts to weaken the Soviet Union by measures of economic embargo. The banning of Russian foodstuffs and the preferential tariffs to the Dominions will also effect the dinner table of the workers by increased food prices. At the same time, English imperialism is lavishly spending the money forced out of the toiling masses in preparation for war. At the expense of the working masses, the Hunger Parliament at the commencement of its present session, and with its interventionist plans well in hand, despite its economy mad policy made an additional appropriation of £9,000,000 for the Territorial Army and at the same time new navy contracts for warships amounting to £7,000,000 were announced. Decaying British imperialism was taking positive steps in preparing for the blood bath that is in the offing.

During all these anti-Soviet war manœuvres, and the attack on the workers' standard of living of the "National" Government, supported by the reformist leadership of the Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress, the rank and file workers have not been passive onlookers. Tremendous mass united front movements, surpassing anything seen since the General Strike of 1926, have been going on. Over the heads of the leadership, the masses in the Labour

Party, Trade Unions, Co-operatives and I.L.P., have been co-operating with the revolutionary workers of the Communist Party and building in the stress of struggle the broad united front so necessary for the present sharp conflict.

PROLETARIAN RESISTANCE.

This resistance is especially seen in the tremendous anti-war Congress held March 4th and 5th, when 1,500 delegates from 300 trade unions and other organisations, met together in a united front and laid the basis for a wide campaign throughout the country. The fundamental line adopted by the Congress was the realisation of the fact that mass action alone can stop war, and that this action must be connected with the struggles for daily economic demands, economic issues. Since the Congress, local and district conferences have been held in practically every important part of the country. The National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers with 126,000 members has affiliated en bloc to the Conference. At the Congress itself, the anti-war enthusiasm showed itself in the spontaneous collection of £180 for the assistance of the seamen at Blyth, who were contemplating strike action against the transport of munitions to China.

With the entry into power of Hitler fascism in Germany, a spontaneous wave of militant demonstrations and protest meetings swept throughout the country. Deputation after deputation interviewed the German Ambassador, demanding the freedom of Comrade Thaelmann, the leader of the C.P. of Germany, and the cessation of the attack on the trade union and political movements. The Llanelly District Council of the Tinsplate Millmen passed a typical resolution, urging the National Executive of the British Iron, Steel and Kindred Trades Association to approach the General Council of the T.U.C. with a view to calling a special conference to discuss the situation in Germany and the fight against fascism.

The deep feeling of resentment against fascism and the strengthening of the whole anti-fascist drive was seen in the reception given Hitler's representative Rosenberg when he came to London. The workers organised demonstrations against him, both at the station on his arrival in the country and at the Press reception, where his whole plans were disorganised by the militant anti-fascist temper of the masses. There is no doubt but that the mass indignation was responsible for the hurried departure of this fascist butcher from the country.

Immediately before and at the time of the passing of the Embargo Bill the extent of the united front efforts and the tremendous support and enthusiasm for the Soviet Union showed itself in the quick reaction among the workers to the provocative action

of the National Government, Resolutions literally poured into the responsible authorities from the Scottish Trade Union Congress, nine trades councils, five divisional Labour Parties, four district committees of unions, three National Union executives, five co-operative guilds, including two quarterly meetings in Cowlares and Blantyre, Scotland, eight N.U.R. branches, twelve T. & G.W.U. branches, ten A.E.U. branches, eight A.S.W. branches, three E.T.U. branches and three municipal workers branches in Edlington, Oldham, and Vale of Leven.*

The temper of the workers is sharply brought to the forefront by the resolution by the Manchester and Salford Trades Council where the proposal by the executive for the inclusion of a paragraph "sympathising with the British engineers" was defeated by the delegates who pointed out "that it was solidarity with the U.S.S.R. that was required, and not sympathy for spies and wreckers." The West Ham Divisional Labour Party also, in its resolution, disassociates itself from "the T.U.C. and Labour Party decision to send a telegram regarding the engineers and condemn the national action."

Arising from the whole campaign, a tremendous demonstration of protest is being organised against

* The number of these has since greatly increased.—Ed.

the militaristic Hendon air display and Empire Day. An intensive campaign of factory gate meetings, leaflet distribution, and local demonstrations have been organised and in London a mighty anti-war pageant is being held in the East End. A broad united front conference has been held with 400 organisations represented.

The decisive struggle of the workers against the National Government drive is best personified in the selection by the Metro-Vickers workers of one of their members for the workers' delegation to the Soviet Union on May 1st. This is an appropriate answer to all the humbug about the engineers' trial.

The interventionist policy of Britain is at its highest peak to-day, and places a serious responsibility on the shoulders of the working-class. Especially the revolutionary movement must strive more energetically than ever before to mobilise the tremendous sentiment existing among the rank and file of the trade unions and Labour Parties into a broad united front movement that will be able to prevent the transport of munitions, build local anti-war councils, and unite by their mass action, and start a mighty protest against the imperialist interventionist plans of the Tory diehards and their lackeys.

THE AMSTERDAM INTERNATIONAL. THE FALL OF THE A.D.G.B. AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNISTS

THE new appalling treason of German social-fascism, finding its expression in the open passage of social-democracy and the reformist trade union bureaucracy to the side of the fascist dictatorship—right down to the acceptance of the fascist phraseology to the extent that existing elements of this treachery were also included in Hitler's war policy—produced an open eruption of the contradictions within international social-fascism and an open breakdown of its internal organisation. If at the basis of the "fascisation" of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals lies the extraordinary sharpening of the contradictions between classes, then, on the other hand the present acceleration of the process of their disintegration is conditioned by the sharpening contradictions between imperialist blocs and separate countries, seeking a way out of the blind alley of the crises by a new division of the world.

Social-democracy even before the commencement of the war stood openly on the side of its national bourgeoisie. The collapse of the Second International proceeds according to the interests of the national bourgeoisies of separate countries and blocs.

The further formal existence of the Second International is conditioned only by the needs of the

bourgeoisie for an international organisation for the struggle with Bolshevism and partially for the interests of one of the international fighting blocs using the Second International for their own purposes under the banner of "the countries of democracy against the countries of dictatorship." The Amsterdam International of Trade Unions, like the Second International actually does not exist as an international organisation. At the conference of the Executive Committee of the reformist Confederation of Labour, in France, the General Secretary of the Confederation and the Vice-Chairman of the Amsterdam International, Leon Jouhaux, openly declared:

"The existing situation in Germany will be deeply reflected in the International of Trade Unions . . . The last manifesto of the All-German Federation of Trade Unions evidently shows that the German trade union movement has refused to oppose and submits to the new régime in the expectation of its inclusion within it. One can pose the question as to whether the Trade Union International will exist any longer or whether it will disappear. Every day brings new less hopeful facts.

The trade union bureaucrats, the leaders of the French Confederation of Labour, put the question, as is to be expected, in exactly the same way, as the leaders of the French Socialist Party, but as befits trade union bureaucrats much more openly and cynically, of the necessity of direct support of the League of Nations and French "democracy," i.e., the French imperialist bourgeoisie.

"The International has been amputated," one of the leaders of the right-wing of the French Socialist Party, Marcel Dea, wrote not long ago. "We can almost say that it no longer exists. The only active element capable of an influence on the course of events is the French Socialist Party. Maybe this is one of the main reasons why it must not prematurely refuse to apply the pressure which it, in its strength, is capable of."

In this "pressure" naturally lies the whole secret of the "internationalism" of the French social-fascists who now assume the rôle of "guardians of the honour" of the Second International. Herein also lies the secret for the sudden removal, at the request of Jouhaux, of the meeting place of the Amsterdam International from Berlin to Paris.

"The union of the democratic nations—this is its only remedy. We must no longer regard democracy as a form of capitalist exploitation."

So Leon Jouhaux declared in his speech before the Executive Committee of the reformist Confederation of Labour. This declaration is all the more interesting inasmuch as it issues from the mouth of a former fervent anti-parliamentarian and syndicalist.

The path of the Amsterdam International is conditioned by the general development of the reformist trade unions for the entire post-war period, just as the collapse of the international trade union secretariat of Karl Legien, was prepared by all the pre-war opportunist degeneration of the trade union movement under the leadership of the social-democrats. This path proceeded from the salvation of the bourgeoisie in the first post-war years—through the *service of capitalist stabilisation*—to the speedy "fascisation" in the time of the extended class struggles of the third period, and to the full *transition* to the side of fascism of the German trade bureaucracy in the face of the approaching decisive revolutionary struggles for the dictatorship of the proletariat in Germany.

The members of the Amsterdam International themselves told how they were busy saving capitalism in the revolutionary years immediately after the war. The former General Secretary of the Amsterdam International, Udegeest, boasted in June, 1924, in the organ of the Dutch social-democrats, "Het Volk" in Holland, that "when the history of our era is written I do not doubt that it will be said that the diplomacy of the Amsterdam International saved Europe from Communism." The Amsterdam

International was only an appendage of the International Labour Bureau of the League of Nations. This path of the *Amsterdam International was the path of the reformist trade union movement of all capitalist countries*. The present stage, concluding the uncompromising and consistent service of the reformist bureaucracy to the task of the salvation of capitalism—the monstrous transition of the German trade union bureaucracy to the side of the blood-fascist hangmen of the German working class—indicates no less clearly and sharply that the road of the German trade union bureaucracy is the road of the whole international reformist trade union bureaucracy; is the road of the entire Amsterdam International. The reformist trade union bureaucracy occupies everywhere an advanced position in the ranks of the social imperialists in the work of preparing a new imperialist slaughter and military intervention in the U.S.S.R. The General Secretary of the Amsterdam International, the Belgian Chevenel, notifies the German social-fascists sent abroad by Wels to counteract the anti-Hitler campaign of the social-democrat and bourgeois Press that the war which will soon break out "will not sweep across the fields of Belgium but across the Rhine." Like the German social-democrats in the Second International; after the partial stabilisation of capitalism, the German trade union bureaucracy gradually gained itself anew the leading rôle in the Amsterdam International. Already during the Paris Congress of the Amsterdam International in 1927 the actual leader of the A.D.G.B., chairman Tarnov of the trade union of Wood Workers, said that "Leipart appears more and more as the only acknowledged authority of the Amsterdam International." After that the German trade union bureaucracy succeeded in removing the headquarters of the Amsterdam International to Berlin. And the new situation now consists in that the *German path* of the reformist trade union bureaucracy in the most powerful organisations of the Amsterdam International goes under the banner of the division into "good" French or Italian trade union bureaucrats and "bad" German trade union bureaucrats, of warring with the "German spirit" in the trade union movement; exactly as is occurring in the camp of the imperialistic bosses themselves. The accusation of Leipart, Grassman, and Tarnov of treason is now the main trump card in the hands of Jouhaux, Chevenel and Citrine for the "fascisation" of their *own* trade unions. "It might have been hoped that the German working class, more powerfully organised than any other, not knowing the splitting up of the trade union movement, would make a gesture able to save the honour of the German working class movement. Nothing of the kind happened." So spoke Leon Jouhaux in his speech indicting the German trade union bureaucracy. The leader of the reformist French Confederation of

Labour more closely allied with the League of Nations and the French general staff than his "socialist" colleagues—parallel with the general theses of the Second International of the "guilt of the Communists" and "the German working class itself" for the victory of Hitler—attacks his German colleagues in the Amsterdam International decidedly more viciously than the leaders of the Second International, who are trying, after the conference of the German social-democrats and a few sorry phrases of Wels about "socialism," to raise German social-democracy on their shield anew. Although one may expect that the acceptance of the last declaration of Hitler in the Reichstag of May 17th, by the social-democrat deputies, exceptional in its foul cowardice, will arouse a new outburst of fierce criticism and attacks in the social-fascist camp.

Nevertheless, in the Amsterdam International the process of disintegration is finding its most eloquent expression in the struggle around the *actions of the German trade union bureaucracy*, and for the control of the work of the Amsterdam International to the advantage of definite imperialist groupings—a more distinct expression than in the "brotherly" ranks of the Second International. The Italian social-fascist paper "Avanti" broke the quite unusual record for frankness in this respect. The Italian "left" trade union bureaucrats as is known "saved the honour" of the Italian trade union movement by fleeing abroad, emigrating to "democratic" France, to the government of which the last conference of the Italian social-fascists in Marseilles felt it necessary to convey its *deep-felt thankfulness*.

"It is time," writes "Avanti," "for the German comrades to clearly understand that the International is not their patrimony. They set the tone, and, to a certain extent, had the right to do so while they were strong. Now they are no longer strong. . . ."

The "good" Italian social-fascists forget only to mention that the Italian trade union bureaucracy under the leadership of Darragona capitulated to fascism in Italy not only in 1927 but also shortly after the advent to power of the fascist dictatorship, Darragona officially declared that as "a socialist" he votes against the new government, but as a representative of the Confederation of Labour, he "abstains" and proposes "technical co-operation." The Amsterdam International differs from the Second International in that its trade union bureaucracy have longer *practical* experience in the collaboration with fascism. The leaders of the Amsterdam International collaborate directly in the International Labour Office of the League of Nations, with the representatives of the so-called fascist corporations. Let the executives of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals ponder the question as to which is better: the Italian or the German trade

union bureaucrats. Our opinion is best expressed in the picturesque language of Heinrich Heine, "Sie stinken alle beide" ("They both stink").

* * *

The actions of the German trade union bureaucracy "shook" not only the "brother" sections of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, but even the leaders of the German social-democrats themselves. Not on account of the treason, of course. The leaders of the German social-democrats and reformist trade unions undoubtedly *divided the work among themselves*, when a group of the most powerful trade union bureaucrats announced their departure from the Social-Democratic Party, and the trade union deputies left the social-democrat fraction. The social-democrats attempted to hold their positions in the mass trade union organisations at all costs. But the trade union bureaucracy had gone so far in their open Hitlerisation that the danger of the flight of the working masses from the trade unions became simply too obvious. As regards this, the appeal of the Reformist, Christian and Hirsch-Dunker Unions, incidentally, recently issued, to all members to pay their membership dues, inasmuch as the influx of dues had practically ceased speaks most eloquently and frankly.

From this follows the "ideological" criticism of the conduct of the trade union bureaucracy by Wels at the party conference, and setting of the leading Press of the Second International of the German social-democrats in opposition to the reformist trade unions. "One can always understand when trade unions bow beneath external pressure," the bulletin of the Second International comments openly on the fascist policy of Leipart and Grassman. "But the attempts of the trade union Press to approve such tactics, theoretically cloaking themselves in fascist ideology and phraseology, are insupportable." As is well known, the editor of the bulletin, Friedrich Adler, in practice adjusted himself to the fascist policy of papal-monarchical government of Dolfuss in Austria. Actually, the Second International sets the leaders of social-democracy in opposition to the German trade union bureaucracy in order to create the myth of the "revolutionary" social-democrats and to efface the impression of the treason of July 20th and the 30th of January among the working masses. Actually, a number of social-democratic parties, for example, the Czech, representatives of which sit in the coalition government, uttered slander against the A.D.G.B. for the "opposition" to the tactics of "the lesser evil" in questions of social policy which seemingly define the refusal of the German social-democrats to join and support the "democratic" government, and swept Hitler into power, drawing the conclusion that the social-democrats must hold with both hands to the coalition with the bourgeoisie. But neither Adler nor Wels is able to bear theoretical

treason. "Together with our colleagues from the trade unions we stood shoulder to shoulder in the vast problems of world outlook. . . . If in this outlook something must be changed it will be for us a tremendous experience," said Otto Wels at the conference of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany. Tremendous indeed for Wels was the threat of the loss, even without force, from the fascist dictatorship, of the mass basis of the trade unions. As regards ideology, Wels can rest at ease. *No such parting of the ways took place.* For did not the German social-democracy, in the person of Hilferding, at the Kiel Party Conference support "economic democracy" as the central hub of its practical policy of the collaboration of classes which was previously theoretically formulated by the main trade union theoretician of A.D.G.B., Karl Zwing. Did not Karl Zwing write that :

"One must not lose sight of the fact that the working class is a part of the capitalist system, the downfall of which system is its own downfall, and therefore the great historical duty of the working class is to obtain by means of the regulation of its place in that system, the improvement of all social structure which is again equivalent to the betterment of its own situation."

And did not Tarnov declare at the Breslau Conference that :

"Marxism as a leading ideology of the working class movement has outlived itself. But as a real great mass movement cannot exist without a corresponding ideology, therefore, we, the leaders of the trade unions, must create a new ideology."

And did not Leipart in the well-known trade union school in Bernau not so long before the coming of Hitler to power, say that :

"No social order can avoid national development. We also defended our fatherland in the world war. . . . We are struggling against being regarded as pacifists—which is hostile to our honour and the interests of our people."

Has not the practice of the German Federation of Labour explained to all members of its trade union organisations, as was the case in the railwaymen's and chemical workers in Hamburg that the "new Government wishes to give bread and work" and "this also suits the trade unions. But that they are averse to the "national" interests of the German bourgeoisie and German fascism no one can accuse them. And was not the new theoretician of the fascisation of the German trade unions, Dunebacker, right when he wrote in the central organ of the A.D.G.B. exactly two weeks before the arrest of the A.D.G.B. leaders, the following :

"The German revolution which began not in March, 1933, nor on July 30th, 1932, but in November, 1918, has entered a new phase. The first step, the Weimar Republic, defined three

tasks : the liquidation of the lost war, the crushing out of Bolshevism, and the saving out of the wrecked order whatever could be saved."

The trade union bureaucracy, together with the social-democrats, did everything to merit the mercy of the national socialist bandits, to show themselves useful to the fascist dictatorship, and at all costs *remain at their posts.* The German trade union bureaucrats insistently recall their former services during the imperialist war, and the struggle with Spartacus. "The history of the trade unions," wrote the organ of the metal workers' union, the most powerful trade union in the world, on the eve of the first of May, "is the mobilisation of the struggle of the German people for the creation of a social order which will embody the spiritual and legal basis for the internal integrity of the nation. The value of this national educative work showed itself especially unambiguously in the fateful days of the world war. But in every crisis of the post-war period the trade unions were also the bearers and the advance fighters for the single will of the German people. . . . The bureaucrats not only chanted pæns of glory to the fascist dictatorship for the appointments of dictators of the separate districts ("Gleichschaltung") but also for the intention of fascism to *abolish the independence of the reformist trade unions* and to include them in the Christian, Hirsch-Dunker and the yellow strike-breaking "trade union" organisations. They not only praised the magnificence and power of the fascist dictatorship, "realising the national revolution" declaring through the mouth of one of the secretaries of the A.D.G.B. in the bourgeois Press (Berliner Tageblatt) that the "national rebirth brings an end to the class society of Germany," but also take upon themselves the practical instructions of the fascist government to call the working masses out on the streets, on the First of May under the banners of the Hitler "National Labour Holiday," knowing very well how the German proletariat hate the wolfish fascist gang, which, thanks to the treason of social-democracy, is wrecking the workers' organisations, choking the workers' Press, outraging and assaulting the workers' quarters. And it is not their fault that the working masses refused the doubtful pleasure of demonstrating under the national socialist banners.

What happened inevitably had to happen. Neither the latest downright treason of the social-democrats nor the open transfer of the reformist trade unions to the side of fascism could nor did stay the hand of the fascist dictators. The fascists require the best means of winning the working masses, whether terror, demagoguery, or the use of social democracy and the reformist bureaucracy. The fascists realise that social-democracy and the reformist trade union

* Gleichschaltung: fascist unification, i.e., establishment of personal fascist régime. See No. 10.

bureaucracy still lead a considerable section of the workers, desire that they shall utilise this influence upon them to actively assist the fascists to win them.

Social-democracy has executed this order of the fascists, displaying the "unity of the nation," under Hitler's leadership, in the stalls of the dope-fiend Goering, his so-called Parliament. The reformist trade union bureaucrats carried out this order still more fervently.

This was the idea of the declaration of the leadership of the A.D.G.B.; such was the idea of its appeal to the workers' with a call to participate in the May 1st holiday of "National German labour." To the sorrow of the union bureaucrats, however, their limitless servile zeal was unavailing.

The trade union masses repudiated their leaders with contempt, refusing to participate in the Hitler celebration on May 1st.

As a result the National Socialists take into their own hands the business of winning the German workers. "To the N.S.F.O. (National Socialist Factory Organisations) belongs the guiding rôle among the awakened German workers," declares the new central organ of the "reformed" and "unified" A.D.G.B. (the fascist "Arbeitertum"). "The leadership of the N.S.F.O. has carefully undertaken the task of thorough preliminary work for the transformation of the N.S.F.O. in the future into the most important weapon of the Empire Government." This explains the fact that the fascist bands of Hitler, on a day following the first of May demonstrations, completely liquidated the old A.D.G.B. and dug firmly into the pockets of the trade union treasurers.

The reformist trade union bureaucracy, just like the German Social-Democratic Party, took good care to open the doors of the trade unions and factories to the national socialists. To-day, relying on the base cowardly policy of the same trade union bureaucrats and social-democrats, which talks the working masses out of the struggle; persuades them that the struggle is now useless, that they must wait "until fascism has run its course," the fascist dictatorship is preparing to open the sluices of the fierce attack of capital on the standard of living of the German proletariat, seizing from the working class, with the aid of the social-democrats the last legal workers' organisations for the defence of their interests.

Now the Second International, like German social-democracy, to hide their new black treachery, endeavour to lay their entire treachery on the T.U. bureaucrats alone.

"The German working class was before and after July 20th ready to fight. . . . There was also a desire for self-defence in the Social-Democratic Party. But the trade union allies did not desire this."

This is the statement of one "importunate" leading social democratic trade union leader in the

central organ of Austrian social-democracy "Arbeiter Zeitung." The political objective of this pretence of the Second International is quite clear. It is necessary to create the legend of the "good" social-democracy and "bad" trade union bureaucracy for a new deception of the workers. A hopeless undertaking, Messrs. Social-Fascists. It is painfully obvious to every honest proletarian that "Sie stinken alle beide."

The fascists aim at winning the working masses and social-democracy and the reformist trade union bureaucracy assist in this by their capitulation. But it depends on the Communist Party whether the fall in the influence of social-democracy is to the advantage, not of fascism—but Communism.

Social-democracy is still, in Germany, the chief social support of the bourgeoisie, restraining the workers from struggle. But the social-democratic workers cannot and do not want to patiently bear the fascist terror and increasingly revolt against their leaders' conduct. Together with this every day brings new proof that Hitler fascism can feed the workers not on bread, but only bullets.

This creates most favourable conditions for the winning of the majority of the working class by the Communists.

In these circumstances, Communists are faced with the most serious task of increasing their mass work by leading all forms of protest on the part of the workers against capitalist exploitation and fascist terror in the factories, by organising a mass movement of protest against the fascisation of the trade unions, by organising a boycott of the commissars, and supporting the refusal to pay membership dues to commissars. This does not mean that Communists and members of the revolutionary trade union opposition will desert the fascisised trade union organisations; it will mean just the opposite: that revolutionary work inside these organisations will be increased. In all the local trade union organisations, where Communists are able to create a mass movement against the commissars and where there exists a movement against payment of membership dues, it is essential that there be set up anti-fascist trade union management committees, elected by trade union members, and to set them the task of organising the anti-fascist struggle inside the factories, and converting the local branches of the erstwhile reformist trade unions into class-conscious trade unions, in spite of and against the will of the commissars, even in cases where these organisations will have to carry on their functions illegally or semi-legally.

We do not doubt that in several cases it will be possible to convert the local organisations of erstwhile reformist trade unions of separate industries, into class-conscious trade union organisations. Should this be so, then it will be essential to begin to unite the Red trade unions which exist parallel to them (the

metalworkers, the miners, etc.) with these class-conscious trade union organisations.

The most important task for the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade union opposition at the present time is to win over the workers in trade unions. The Communists must set an example by their stubborn, systematic and self-sacrificing defence of the daily economic and political interests of the workers and their trade union organisations against all and sundry encroachments of fascism; *they must show that they alone are capable of realising the united front of the proletariat, of once more building up a mass trade union movement*, based on the class struggle of the proletariat. There must not be a single trade union organisations outside the organised work of the Communists, and the members of the revolutionary trade union opposition. Communists and members of the revolutionary trade union opposition now have a favourable objective opportunity of winning over the trade union masses to their side, by showing them that the policy of the reformist leaders has led to the trade unions being handed over to the fascists and to the collapse of the German Trade Union Federation; by showing them that that, for which thousands of revolutionary workers were expelled from trade unions by the trade union bureaucracy, was the only correct policy, and that the revolutionary trade union opposition *is the only force in the reformist trade unions which consistently defends the class-conscious trade unions and consistently fights for a class-conscious trade union movement*.

This means that the Communists and the revolutionary trade union opposition should launch an extensive campaign under the slogan of defence of workers' savings, the return of trade union property stolen by the fascists, and on behalf of elected leadership of trade union organisations. The fury of the trade union masses must be aroused against the commissars appointed by the fascists in the trade unions, by mobilising the masses against recognition of these commissars. Finally, in connection with the unprecedented political and organisational bankruptcy of social-democracy and the trade union bureaucracy, together with the disillusionment felt concerning the tactics of the German Trade Union Federation (A.D.G.B.) not only by the broad masses of trade union members, but also among considerable strata of the lower trade union officials, the possibility is created and the necessity arises of creating a broad

basis of active trade unionists from among the non-party and social-democratic, anti-fascist functionaries.

At the same time, the German Communist Party the revolutionary trade union opposition and the trade unions should pay serious attention to the Nazi factory organisations N.S.B.O. The leadership of the National Socialist Party is trying to convert the fascist workshop organisations in the factories into militant terrorist organisations of the capitalists. The task of the Communists, and members of the revolutionary trade union movement, is first and foremost to organise a relentless, tireless, daily struggle against fascist organisations. It is perfectly obvious that the active members of the German Communist Party and the revolutionary trade union opposition, who are well known in the factories, will be unable to join the national socialist workshop organisations, for by joining themselves, they would stimulate others to do so, and thus compromise the German Communist Party and their own revolutionary cause. But, since in several factories, and even in whole branches of industry (for example, the municipal undertakings) there exists compulsory membership of workers in the Nazi workshop organisations and the many facts of workers joining under threat of being dismissed from the undertaking and being left unemployed—it is essential that the workers be urged not to join the fascist workshop organisations; this is the first duty of revolutionaries in the trade union movement. It is essential that be made clear that the Nazi workshop organisations can give nothing and will give nothing to the workers—neither bread, nor work—but that they will bring them only inexorable capitalist slavery. At the same time it is essential for revolutionary elements inside the Nazi workshop organisations to carry out *systematic work* to explain the position, by leading the forms of the movement of protest of the workers against these organisations against fascist dictatorship.

Only on the basis of this policy and by means of tireless, practical work to put it into practice, will the Communists and the revolutionary trade union opposition be able to prepare for the creation of a mass revolutionary trade union movement, and rapidly realise its task of winning over the majority of the proletariat during the process of preparing for the decisive revolutionary struggles for the overthrow of fascist dictatorship and the establishment of proletarian dictatorship.

THE CONSTITUTION FOR THE ENSLAVEMENT OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE AND THE POLICY OF THE INDIAN BOURGEOISIE

By VALIA

THE draft constitution for India is now published. After five years of work, carried out through the medium of the Labour and Conservative Governments, *British imperialism has elaborated a constitution for enslaving, oppressing and barbarously exploiting the Indian people.* The whole essence of the constitution is precisely that British imperialism will strengthen its domination over the enslaved country by other methods in the new conditions. British imperialism does not deny this. Baldwin, in a speech published in the "Times" on May 13th, shows once again that power will remain entirely in the hands of the Viceroy and the British Parliament, etc. According to him, the task is to take account of the changed conditions and the awakening of the masses of India, and to try to "build an edifice which will stand against time and weather, irrespective of changes of government in the House." It is possible to construct such an edifice, he continued, if some "Indian elements" are brought in. Such elements are the feudal-landlord, usurious groups. "The collaboration of the Indian princes in the administration of the new India has always been our ideal." "A federation in which the princes participate would without doubt bring in the element of stability, since there are no more loyal supporters of the British throne than the Indian princes" (Baldwin). Thus British imperialism sees the salvation of its power in India in the formation of a federation with the participation of the princes in the Government and the inclusion of the feudal elements. But even this task it undertakes with great reluctance (revolt of Churchill), understanding that with the present relationship of class forces "everyone must admit that the British Government cannot do anything" (Baldwin).

All the practical measures in the constitution are based on this principle: the strengthening of the feudal imperialist bloc. Some of the concessions to the Indian bourgeoisie are founded on this. British imperialism is striving to strengthen its basis in the country and reach agreement with the Indian bourgeoisie for jointly warding off and suppressing the approaching revolution, and obtaining support in case of a new world war or intervention in the U.S.S.R. The special difficulty in the situation of British imperialism is that all these concessions, "reforms" and negotiations have to be carried out in the conditions of deepening crisis, which nullifies the significance of all concessions (the temporary reduction of taxes on the peasants in the United Provinces and a few other districts, etc.) and which assists the

growth of the revolutionary awakening of new strata of the masses of the people. The period of "reforms" in 1933 differs radically from that of 1922, when the country had begun to emerge from the crisis.

A review of 1932, and the beginning of 1933, shows how the crisis is developing and, furthermore, how it has now strongly hit the cotton industry, which in 1930-32 was working at full capacity.

By way of illustration we first give a few characteristic figures.

Fall of Prices (1924=100)

	Grain	Tea.	Raw Jute.	Cotton.	Average for all goods.
1929	.. 119	101	140	—	134
1930	.. 84	102	99	—	100
1931	.. 73	63	78	97	96
1932	.. 64	57	71	87	86

The fall of prices continued right through 1932 and is continuing in 1933, testifying to the ruin of the peasants, the growth of hunger and starvation, accompanied by a growth in the reserves of finished goods, food products, etc. The home market has narrowed down and difficulties are increasing for the whole economic life of the country.

The fall of prices is accompanied by a destruction of productive forces and a fall in production. The following figures on the sown area and the output of iron confirm this.

Reduction of the Sown Area. (in 1,000 acres)

	Jute.	Cotton.	Wheat.	Rice.
1929-30	.. 3,317	25,922	31,654	31,131
1930-32	.. 1,862	23,522	33,745	32,985
1932-33	.. 1,899	22,350	31,829	30,655

In 1930-31 under the influence of the crisis, the peasants began to change over from industrial raw material to wheat, from high grade cultures to low grade. This caused a growth in the grain crops. In 1932 the crisis undermined even this attempt of the peasants to offer resistance. The degradation of agriculture which is the result of feudal landlord and moneylenders' oppression and imperialist super-exploitation in the conditions of the crisis, leaves no way out for the peasants except the path of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution.

During the last ten years, the harvest of wheat per acre has fallen from 760 lbs. to 600 lbs., rice in 1932 from 877 lbs. to 837 lbs. per acre (Mukerji, "Bombay Chronicle," Jan. 10th, 1933). And while the average

area under wheat throughout India in 1932 fell by 4 per cent., in the Punjab, the basic wheat district, it fell by 15 per cent ("Capital," Feb 16th, 1933)

The figures for industry confirm the same conclusion, namely, that in 1932 the main factor was the crisis, which struck with special force at those branches in which the rate of fall in the first few years of the crisis was less than in the others

	Pig-iron	Cast steel	Finished steel.	Coal (average monthly)
1930	714	624	431	1,927,000 tons
1931	804	602	449	1,752,000 "
1932	650	500	400	1,580,000 "

The crisis affected the cotton industry at the end of 1932 still more severely. In Bombay alone over twenty-five factories closed. Enormous reserves of textile goods lie in the warehouses.

The outlook is not reassuring. The impoverishment of the masses, the fall in the personal and industrial consumption, the increasing competition of foreign capital, including Japanese, the structural crisis of the entire economics of the country as a whole, gasping under the burden of feudal relics and foreign oppression, etc., all in the conditions of a world crisis, show that the "reforms" and concessions of the British imperialists will not bring any improvement or quietness, but will lead to a further development of the revolutionary movement, for they give additional material for the exposure of national reformism, which is trying to disorganise the struggle of the masses of the people, and distract them from revolutionary methods of struggle.

The growing crisis is also portrayed in the fact that in 1932-33 India had an unfavourable trade balance for the first time during the years of the crisis.

	(in million rupees).		
	1930-31.	1931-32.	1932-33
Export ..	1,903.5	1,307.5	1,078.5
Re-export	43.1	40.2	27.0
Import ..	1,371.2	1,048.6	1,122.6
	+ 575.4	+ 299.1	- 17.1

It was mainly through the favourable balance that British imperialism was able to materialise the fruits of its plunder of the Indian people by exporting raw material, etc. In 1932, when raw material could not find such a ready sale on the world market, the British imperialists transferred the burdens of the crisis on to the shoulders of the toiling masses of India and took the path of pumping gold out of the country, using for this purpose the network of landlords and moneylenders and also the State apparatus (taxes, punitive expeditions, etc.). From September, 1931, to December, 1932, British imperialism pumped 111½ crore* of roubles in gold out of the country.

* 1 crore equals 10 million rupees.

In the main, this shows the ruination of the peasants and the small toiling circles of the town. The British economic journal "Capital" (Calcutta, Feb. 2nd) was forced to admit that "the inflow of gold is greatest from the districts of the United Provinces, where the agrarian crisis is sharpest. It should be remembered that the inflow of gold began not long before the gold standard was abolished, and the price of gold was not too high." And this cannot be understood by some investigators who attribute the draining of gold out of the country to speculation and nothing else. However, this same paper "Capital," on December 8th, 1932, wrote :

"The fact that India, in spite of the fall in the exports of goods, was able to escape a terrible financial and commercial catastrophe, is to be explained first of all by the export of a tremendous amount of gold which the Minister of Finance correctly described as the 'decisive factor' . . . The only immediate and really effective method of avoiding an awful catastrophe is the continuation of the export of gold and consequently all other considerations must be subordinated to this aim."

British imperialism sees an "awful catastrophe" in the stoppage in the draining of profits and super-profits out of the country, part of which profits goes to support the apparatus of oppression in India. The Provincial Government of the United Provinces was forced to admit that the tenants "preferred to leave the land and abandon their rights rather than pay the rent which the circumstances had made high."

As the result, in 1931 alone the number of such refusals increased from 26,860 to 71,430. The truth of this is shown by the fact that this same Provincial Government was forced to admit that the number of orders for the forced collection of the land tax was 256,284. The figures for 1932 and 1933 testify to the growing ruin of the masses, and the deepening of the crisis. The rebellion of 80,000 peasants in the principality of Alwar shows that the peasant masses are more and more beginning to spontaneously abandon the reformist methods of the national bourgeoisie.

The masses of the people are more and more losing hope in the methods and the leadership of the National Congress. The "concessions" of British imperialism, to the bourgeoisie, do not make things any easier for the toiling masses. Beneath outward quiet deep processes are taking place among the rank and file of the people ; the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois National Congress feel this, and fear it. And the concessions which British imperialism throws them are pitifully small. In the sphere of constitutional reform, it becomes possible for the bourgeoisie to participate in the administration of several secondary "ministries," but even this only within the limits set by the British Government. The bourgeoisie, together with, and under the command of, the

imperialist feudalists, receive the possibility of participating in the distribution of about 20 per cent. of the State budget of India. A reserve bank is to be formed, subordinated to British capital. At the expense of competitors from Japan, Belgium, Java, etc., British imperialism agrees to give support to the cotton, sugar, paper and several other branches of industry, including the Tata enterprises, so that the national bourgeoisie will support the British Empire ("preferential tariffs," etc.). In introducing "reforms" and proposing "concessions," British imperialism simultaneously threatens the bourgeoisie, repeating to them that only in alliance with Great Britain can they hope to avoid "anarchy" (i.e., revolution) in the country and not become the victims of the attacks of any other country (Japan, etc.) as are taking place with China.

All the facts show that the Indian bourgeoisie, while protesting and expressing dissatisfaction with the concessions and not abandoning the demand for further concessions in future, are nevertheless in accord with the idea of accepting an agreement with British imperialism. The national bourgeoisie, who, with the aid of the National Congress, have led the movement for the last few years, emasculating it of its revolutionary contents, have simultaneously conducted themselves loyally towards British imperialism. For instance, it is sufficient to mention that they subscribed a considerable sum in support of the internal loan issued by the British Government. During the last few years British imperialism has issued new loans and converted old ones to the sum of 800 million rupees. The Indian bourgeoisie, though howling about oppression and compulsion, nevertheless gave support to the Government of the enslavement of India, because they feared a popular revolution.

The bourgeois nationalist Press of India greeted the draft constitution with sharp criticism, cursing it with everything they could lay their tongues to, but nevertheless the main conclusion which it draws is about as follows: We must adapt ourselves, we must not boycott the elections to the legislative organs, but go to them and utilise the constitution for ourselves and fight from within for its alteration. To this should be added that the non-co-operation movement must be stopped, because we cannot always act with negative methods.

In acting against the national revolution, the Indian bourgeoisie link up their fate with the feudal landlord strata. While advocating merely a few reforms in the sphere of agrarian relationships, the elimination of the native princes, etc., the bourgeoisie willingly accepted the proposal of federation, hoping that they would be able to bring the feudal landlord circles over to their side in the future. The line now long operated by the Indian bourgeoisie is not the line of revolution, but the line of a bloc with

the feudal landlord circles for bargaining and re-bargaining with British imperialism, the line of a bloc acting by parliamentary (and economic) measures. Not the path of revolution but the path of a bloc with the imperialists against the revolutionary people and the international proletariat. This path is the path of national reformist counter-revolution, which does not augur any considerable successes even to the bourgeoisie, in their quarrels with British imperialism.

Lenin long since pointed out, and international experience has confirmed, that in the epoch of imperialism, monopoly capitalism strives to convert the semi-colonial countries (China, etc.) into colonial countries, and that the *only* path of the oppressed peoples to liberation is the revolutionary insurrection, the national revolutionary war against imperialism, in alliance with the international proletariat.

In carrying on a struggle against the revolutionary workers and peasants, the Indian bourgeoisie have taken part in the work of the "Round Table" Conference, and are adapting themselves to the constitution. In criticising it, they make a series of concrete demands which were openly stated in their declaration by Birla, Toakurda and Hirarchand, the most prominent leaders of the National Congress, and the closest associates of Gandhi. Among the most prominent concrete demands put forward by the bourgeoisie are the following: The rapid formation of a federation, and the formation of a reserve bank, the prohibition of the export of gold, the releasing of the rupee from fixed higher exchange with sterling, an increase in the part of the State budget in which they will participate by transferring some of the military expenses to the account of Great Britain, and some reductions by revising the National Debt, giving the bourgeoisie the right to regulate the railways, and also to adopt all kinds of laws against foreign competition.

The demands of the bourgeoisie deal only with the question of a new redistribution of the profits from the plundering of the masses of the people in their own favour. This programme of the bourgeoisie corresponds to the programme of the National Congress. The bourgeois National Congress is trying to divert the attention of the masses of the people from the question of the struggle for independence and the destruction of the feudal landlord system, to reformist activity, the rectifying of some of the forms of caste inequality. The bourgeois National Congress has sabotaged and disorganised the struggle of the peasant masses, being mortally afraid of the agrarian revolution. Recently the organ of the Congress, "Mahratta," on January 8th, had good reason to write against the rebellious Alwar peasants, that "Although it is correct for the Government not to interfere in the affairs of a native state, at the same time it is their duty to prevent provocators from

without causing disorder in a native state. The pan-Islam agitators have attained their ends in Kashmir, and now it is plain that they have chosen a new victim, the state of Alwar."

The organ of the National Congress called on British imperialism to send troops to crush the peasant revolt, which it actually did. For its treacherous, anti-peasant, anti-revolutionary policy, the National Congress always used the cover of pretending falsely that the peasant revolt is a Hindu-Musselman dispute, that it is a reactionary religious quarrel. The bourgeois National Congress, under the leadership of Gandhi, is trying to carry out the old plan of 1922 once more, i.e., transfer the movement from the revolutionary objectives to the path of reform, using however, a different excuse, and acting as the protector (!) of the oppressed castes. But, even here, it does not advocate the abolition of castes but their democratisation and reform.

This leads us to one of the chief problems, on which a clear answer will have to be given—what is the class character of Gandhism and what is its evolution? This answer has a direct relation to preparation of a correct Bolshevik policy, the question of the hegemony of the proletariat, and the estimate of national reformism and its evolution.

In the speeches of Indian comrades (1931-32), the reply is given that Gandhism is now the theory of the bourgeoisie, but its origin, source and class nature were previously different. "The breakdown of the non-co-operation movement of 1919-22, and the defeat of the anti-imperialist forces caused a process of differentiation in the ranks of the Congress, which, at that time, was entirely guided by the petty-bourgeois philosophy of Gandhi (Gandhism in its origin is a clear petty bourgeois philosophy with its emphasis on weaving, celibacy and anti-machine slogans). The revolt of Das and Nehru against the Gandhist tactics of boycott of the fiendish legislative chambers was the first manifestation of the open break of the class-conscious agents of the bourgeoisie with Gandhi's petty bourgeois spiritual philosophy. Here it should be remembered that the liberal bourgeois leaders were put aside on the eve of the non-co-operation movement and the Congress was captured by the supporters of Gandhi, who was greatly taken up with spiritual Tolstoyan philosophy. The non-co-operation movement could have been guided, and was destroyed owing to the vacillations of petty bourgeois philosophy," and further, "non-resistance changed from a doctrine of the helplessly fatalist bourgeois, impotently submitting to the terror, to the conscious strategy of the bourgeoisie." (From "Materials of a Group of Indian Communists.")

The reply is obviously incorrect. A supplementary feature of this answer is the following estimate of the workers' movement of 1919-22, which was given by the same group of Indian Communists :

"Under the treacherous leadership of the agents of the bourgeoisie, the working class kept aside from the great mass struggle."

Thus, in the opinion of these comrades, Gandhism is the economic and political philosophy of the petty bourgeoisie who are involved in their incorrect Tolstoyan principles, and therefore it leads to defeat. The petty bourgeoisie in 1919-22 isolated the bourgeoisie and took away from the leadership of the National Congress. Non-resistance is a weapon of the petty bourgeoisie. The petty bourgeoisie brought defeat to the movement in 1919-22. And although the authors of this opinion recognise that the Gandhism of 1930 is bourgeois, they nevertheless maintain that the movement in 1930 was petty bourgeois, that the proletariat followed the petty bourgeoisie, and that, as the result of this, there was "reaction" in the ranks of the working class, etc., i.e., the petty bourgeoisie were once again in the leadership as in 1919-22. Hence a hand is proffered to the idea of Roy that the task was therefore to replace the old leaders of the National Congress by new ones, more "left." The bourgeoisie, the proletariat and the peasants thus disappear from the field of view. The Roy group wrote in 1932 that the whole difficulty is that "if any pressure is put on any leader of the Congress, he is driven into a corner where he sacrifices the political programme of full national freedom at the altar of the ethical teachings of non-violence," and in another leaflet, that "the defeat of the Gandhist leadership of the Congress took place, because it represented non-revolutionary ideology, utopian sentiment and political illusion."

Such an estimate of Gandhism as petty bourgeois philosophy leading to defeat, owing to its utopian ideals and incorrect ethical teachings, still finds support among some of the followers of the revolutionary movement and is extremely harmful, hindering the process of the development of revolutionary Marxism.

It is not correct to claim that in 1919-22 the petty bourgeoisie were at the head. In 1919-22 the leadership of the people's movement was in the hands of the bourgeoisie, who succeeded in getting the support of the petty bourgeois mass by means of slogans popular among the backward Indian masses, and the slogan of non-violence stood for the interests of the bloc of the bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords who feared the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. Gandhi and other leaders of the Congress have repeatedly stated this.

It is not true that the essence of Gandhism was the struggle for hand-looms against machines. To refute this, it is sufficient to quote the resolution of the session of the National Congress in 1920 (not to mention practice) where it says :

"In so far as non-co-operation was introduced as a measure of discipline and self-sacrifice, without

which the nation cannot attain real progress . . . the session of the National Congress advises that Swadesh* be adopted on a wide scale in respect to cotton goods, and as the existing factories of India with national capital and control do not produce sufficient yarn and cloth for the needs of the people, and will probably not be in a position to do so for a long time, the session of the National Congress advises that further production be stimulated on a large scale by increasing hand spinning in every house and hand-weaving by millions of weavers, who have given up work owing to lack of support."

The resolution was carried with the help of Gandhi. A study of the decisions of the National Congress of this period, including the resolution (Bardoli) on ceasing the non-co-operation campaign owing to the actions of the workers and peasants, all show that the National Congress, like Gandhism, represented the interests of the bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords. It puts in the first place, the interests of the capitalists.

The bourgeois National Congress wished to give support to home industries, which represent a fairly big economic force, not at the expense of the bourgeoisie, but at the expense of imperialism, and as a force which is not a serious opponent of industrial capital. Starting with the slogans and ending with the statement (Nagpur session, 1920) that "The ideal of the Indian National Congress is to establish Swaraj† for the Indian people by lawful and peaceful means," *the National Congress and Gandhism have carried on a consistent policy of defence of the interests of the bourgeoisie and the landlord system.*

The starting point in determining the class essence of Gandhism is the statement of Comrade Stalin in his report at the XVI. Congress of the C.P.S.U. :

"As for assistants (i.e., of imperialism) of the type of Gandhi, Tsarism had shoals of them in the form of liberal conciliators of every kind, from which, however, nothing but confusion arose."

Such a position is supported by the platform of action of the C.P. India, where it is said that :

"The policy of Gandhism on which the programme of the Congress is based, under the cover of vague phrases on love, peace, an unassuming and hardworking life, the easing of the lot of the peasant, national unity, the special historical mission of Hinduism, etc., propagates and defends the interests of the national bourgeoisie . . . advocates the interests of the capitalist development of India on the bodies and the oppression of the toiling masses of the country, in alliance with world imperialism."

The circumstances were such that in 1919-22 and later, Gandhism succeeded in carrying the masses with it. This is explained by the fact that Gandhism emerged on the arena at the time of the breaking

of social relations, the growth of native capitalism (during the war and later), the world war, which tore millions of peasants from the villages, the awakening of the peasants and the proletariat, the tremendous rise of hatred of British rule. Gandhism succeeded in utilising the influence of religion, patriarchal-caste traditions, the naiveness, "non-resistance to evil" of the enslaved masses, their lack of understanding that new social relations were growing up, interwoven with pre-capitalist forms of plunder and domination. Gandhism was able to utilise the growing protest of the masses of the people, their confused desire to change the existing conditions, a desire without a realisation that the exploited proletariat and the peasants form a revolutionary force, whose interests are opposed to those of the bourgeoisie. Classes began to separate only in the course of the struggle for independence, in the course of the class struggle. The working class began to take form as a separate class force, and the anti-revolutionary nature of the bourgeoisie became more and more clear and definite.

Gandhism is now again demonstrating its liberal anti-revolutionary nature. The working class and the peasants are moving to the left, and new fights are maturing, but the bourgeoisie are moving to the right, striving to demoralise the revolutionary forces.

British imperialism has issued its draft of the constitution, i.e., a new and more flexible form of strengthening its domination, while the bourgeois National Congress is preparing to take a direct part in carrying it out. The Congress organ "Maharatta" recognised as early as January 15th, 1933 :

"We must note the fact that, at the present time, the leaders of the Congress are directing the attention of the people to the problem of abolishing 'untouchability' (i.e., pariahs) and thus distracting them from the questions which have direct political importance. . . . It is not difficult to understand that the concentration of the attention of the people on the question of the untouchables, the right to enter the temple, is equivalent to repudiation of the movement for which the Congress leaders and their supporters are now in prison."

The Congress, hiding behind the "struggle" for the abolition of the pariah system, is preparing the ground for adopting the constitution worked out by British imperialism. Thus the National Congress is literally repeating the manœuvre which it carried out in 1922. But this time the bourgeoisie are making a miscalculation, because in contradistinction to 1922, the economic crisis is sharpening, the revolutionary movement is growing and the Communist movement is beginning to appear on to the scene.

Thus, *Gandhism was, and is, the philosophy of the bourgeoisie and the landlords. It is not right to state that its drawback consisted and still consists in reactionary, utopian petty bourgeois principles, because it was*

* "Swadesh": The movement in favour of national industry.

† "Swaraj": Self-government.

and is the teachings of the cowardly anti-revolutionary bourgeoisie, linked up with the landlord system and in deadly fear of a national revolution. This is the essence of the matter.

Gandhi and the National Congress are now trying to prepare the ground for carrying out the constitution and this shows that the process of the swing to the right on the part of the bourgeoisie is continuing. The cross-bred results of the Round Table Conference and the policy of the National Congress have undoubtedly called forth an increase in the ferment and discontent among the rank and file members of the National Congress, among the petty bourgeoisie, not to speak of the proletariat and the toiling peasants.

This will, without question, cause a growth of class differentiation, the rallying together of the revolutionary proletariat, possibly the appearance of revolutionary and also semi-radical petty bourgeois groups and organisations. The correctness of the policy, the slogans and the paths indicated by the Communists will become plainer and plainer to ever wider strata of the toiling masses and also to the members of the revolutionary organisations.

Among the leaders of the national movement, there will possibly begin a re-estimation of values, and some of them may fix their gaze on the other side of the Atlantic, on the American bourgeoisie. It is possible that some of them, at any rate for a time, will come nearer to the international workers' movement. However, the facts show that the fundamental

organisations of the bourgeois nationalist movement will at present still orientate themselves on British imperialism.

The Indian bourgeoisie are now trying to build up a united front of all parties. They propose to call an all-Indian conference of all parties and mass organisations, and, hiding behind semi-oppositional gestures, will try to keep the leadership in their hands and prevent the proletariat becoming an independent leading force, the leader of the masses of the people.

However, with the present relationship of class forces and the home and international conditions, the bourgeoisie will not be able to stop the development of the revolutionary movement. And this means that the possibility of splits from the National Congress, the formation of new parties inside, or outside, the National Congress is very real. The bourgeoisie are trying to play an active anti-revolutionary rôle, utilising the experience of the late League of Independence, an experience which is sufficiently rich and characteristic. The Indian Communists should study all this, for it depends on their correct policy at this time whether a decisive blow will be struck at national reformism or, in other words, how rapidly a mass Communist Party will be formed, the only leader of the masses of the people of India, capable of carrying the country along the path of liberation from imperialism and the oppression and slavery of the landlords and money-lenders. The tactics and tasks of the Indian Communists in these conditions will be dealt with separately.

XIIth PLENUM LIBRARY

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Resolutions and Theses 2d. 5cts. | Workers 2d. 5cts.
(Report by D. Z. Manuilsky, C.P.S.U.) |
| 2. "Prepare for Power." (The International Situation and the tasks of the sections of the Communist International!) 4d. 15cts.
(Report by O. Kuusinen) | 5. "Fulfil the Decisions." (The C.P.s of France and Germany and the tasks of the Communists in the Trade Unions) 2d. 5cts.
(Report by O. Piatnitsky) |
| 3. "War in Far East." (The Danger of Imperialist War and Military Intervention in connection with the War which has broken out in the Far East) 2d. 5cts.
(Report by Okano. C.P. Japan) | 6. Great Britain, Ireland and America ... 2d. 5cts.
(Speeches by Gusev, Pollitt, Troy and an American Comrade) |
| 4. The Soviet Union and the World's | 7. XIIth Plenum Handbook (Propagandists' Guide to the decisions of the XII Plenum) 4d. 10cts. |

NATIONAL PROBLEMS IN CHINA

By GEORGE SAFAROV.

I.—THE POLICY OF IMPERIALISM, THE CHINESE REVOLUTION AND NATIONAL PROBLEMS.

JAPANESE imperialism has put the question of a new partition of China upon the order of the day. It announced the fact to the whole world by the thunder of artillery on the fields of Manchuria and in Shanghai. It has annexed Manchuria and Jehol and is trying to seize the whole of North China, using for this purpose the old Japanophile Anfu clique and Yan Si-chan and Co. as well. French imperialism, despite the diplomatic cooling off which to a certain extent followed, gave Japanese imperialism no slight assistance in its policy of annexions and robbery. English imperialism, diplomatically "standing aloof" from any open support of the Japanese seizures, at the same time made it clear that she would not object to a new partition of China among the imperialists, provided her own interests were observed. The interests of American imperialism encounter those of Japanese imperialism, since the dollar empire prefers to be the chief ruling force in China, and the pan-Asiatic plans of imperialist Japan constitute a serious menace to her from the point of view of the struggle for domination in the Pacific Ocean.

Japanese imperialism is hastening to make use of the world crisis and the critical state of international imperialist relations, especially in connection with the acute turn in the situation in Europe, in order to seize as many tit-bits as possible, and prepare the necessary *place d'armes* for anti-Soviet intervention. It is not surprising, moreover, that Japanese imperialism at the same time adopts the rôle of the "only" support of imperialist "order" in the Far East. While in 1932 the chief excuse given was that "China is only a geographical conception," nowadays yet another excuse is being added to this by Japanese imperialism—that the Soviet movement in China is a menace to the very foundation of imperialist domination of the Chinese people. This excuse was used before, and was reflected in the report of the Lytton Commission. But now it is coming more to the forefront in indubitable connection with the successes of the Soviet movement.

The "Japanese Chronicle" writes very frankly about this:

"Insufficient attention has been paid to the Chinese Communist movement," we read in the issue of March 11th, "but perhaps the present events in Szechwan will compel Nanking and the Powers interested in the Far East, to become conscious of the fact that a movement is going on which is destined to play a bigger rôle in the cause of China's national union than all the other events that have happened since the

uprising against Manchuria. . . . It is quite clear that the successes in Szechwan have been possible only in consequence of the diversions of the Reds in Shensi. This contact and this co-ordination of action is alarming Nanking and, of course, should alarm the Powers. For therein lies the hope of a true union of China, and it is not at all profitable and not in the interests of certain Powers."

This forced recognition speaks for itself. The Soviet movement in China has already grown into a decisive force in the national colonial, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. Behind it is the force of a true national revolution. It takes upon itself the task of freeing China from the yoke of imperialism, of uniting China nationally and winning State independence. This movement is the only serious force in the struggle against the partition of China, against China's being torn in pieces.

The Soviet movement has begun the unification and emancipation of China from below, by revolutionary methods, on the basis of Soviets, under the leadership of the glorious Chinese Communist Party. The cut-throats of Japanese imperialism fortify their annexational brigandage by references to this fact, thus trying to draw over to their side, or at least to neutralise, the other imperialists.

At the same time they try to mobilise themselves in support of all that is left of old feudal China, thanks to the rule of imperialism in China. They speculate upon the rule of feudal survivals, and upon the fact that China is a semi-colony and therefore backward, and divided. They trump not only Pu Yi, the Anfu clique and so on, but also pan-Mongolism, the mythical Manchurian nation within the confines of Manchuria, etc.

Old feudal China formed and developed through the enslavement of the Chinese toilers and the exploited majority, and through the enslavement of several non-Chinese peoples, whom it tried to take to its feudal bosom. The numerical composition of the non-Chinese, foreign nationalities dwelling in the confines of China, has never been established exactly, but doubtless there are many tens of millions—perhaps a hundred million—grouped chiefly on the outskirts. It is sufficient to indicate Tsintian, Inner Mongolia, Kiangsu, several compact districts of foreign nationalities in South China, to get a worthy estimate of the significance of the national problem in China.

The Japanese imperialists, who suck the life-blood of the Korean people in Manchuria, use their agents to urge the Koreans, driven out of their native Korea by hunger and poverty, against the Chinese, pretending to be the "defenders" of Korean national interests.

At the same time they exploit the Koreans in Manchuria in the most barbaric manner themselves.

Of the old Manchurian tribes which came to China together with the Manchurian dynasty, there remain only settlements of Manchurians in a few towns of Inner China. This does not prevent the Japanese pillagers from appearing in the guise of restorers of the Manchurian State in Manchuria, where the Chinese form the overwhelming majority of the population, and real Manchurians are almost non-existent.

For more than one decade, the Japanese robbers, together with other knights of the great imperialist road, have stretched out their greedy tentacles to enslave the Mongols. Now, having bought over the feudal princes and reactionary feudal lords of the Llama monasteries, they flaunt themselves as the "emancipators" who have freed Mongolia from the Chinese yoke.

These tendencies to use non-Chinese peoples and national minorities for the purpose of making an imperialist partition of China and enslaving her are common to all the imperialists. This policy of "divide and rule" is pursued by French imperialism which is trying to extend its annexations through Yunnan, Kwangsi, etc. English imperialism is speculating on pan-Islamism, paid cash down, by linking up with the feudal reactionary upper strata of the Oes peoples in Kiangsu and adding fuel to the fire of the anti-Chinese movement in Tsintian for the purpose of converting the latter into a new English sphere of influence and a *place d'armes* against the U.S.S.R. From Tibet, where she is firmly installed, she provokes conflicts between the Tibetans and the Chinese.

All those who participated in the imperialist plunder and oppression of China exploit and oppress not only the Chinese, but together with them, and frequently to a greater degree, the non-Chinese peoples as well. In Inner Mongolia the Catholic missions and monasteries of the imperialist civilisers have taken possession of extensive lands, having confiscated them from the Mongols. The commercial travellers and agents of foreign capital plunder the Mongolian population just as though they were conquerors in the land. The same state of affairs exists in Kiangsu and other parts.

All the non-Chinese peoples and national minorities of China feel the heavy burden of the "key positions of imperialism" upon their own shoulders. Owing to the great subjection and backwardness of the non-Chinese population and the rampant policy of suppression and strangulation of the non-Chinese nationalities pursued by the Kuomintang, these nationalities probably more than the Chinese themselves, feel all the force of imperialism as a barrier on the road to their national consolidation and independent national development on their backs.

However, in consequence of these same causes, this is registered in their minds only with great difficulty and very gradually. For they seldom see the cannon of imperialism right under their noses; they live on the outskirts, in the wildest corners of China, on the fringe of deserts, jungles and at the foot of high mountains, where they were driven by Chinese feudalism. This is all to the good as far as imperialism is concerned, for it can use this backwardness and weakness of class differentiation among these peoples *against the Chinese revolution*. Just like Napoleon III, who sought new possessions in Europe by speculating on the unsolved national questions of the nineteenth century, the imperialists speculate on the unsolved national questions in China for the purpose of making a new and more fundamental partition of China. This new partition of China bodes still further degradation, still more cruel enslavement, for the non-Chinese nationalities. The imperialist plunderers, while bringing additional bondage to the oppressed nationalities of China, at the same time spur them on to the only force capable of bringing them emancipation, to the Chinese revolution!

Thus extending its tentacles further and further into China, international imperialism endeavours to strengthen its *annexational* position by speculating, as it were, on the *internal* problems of China.

But this is only one side of the affair. These problems, on the other hand, arise in all their sharpness under the influence of several other factors: (1) of the progressive breakdown of Kuomintang rule, (2) of the general economic and agrarian-colonial crisis, (3) in the ever-growing influx of non-Chinese peoples and national minorities into the stream of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal movement. The latter circumstance is the last numerically, but the first in importance.

The newspapers issued in China are studded with information of uprisings or the revolutionary movement in one or other of the foreign districts. Recently the newspapers reported an uprising of the Lao in the north-west part of Kwangsi, and they mention, incidentally, that it had taken place under the influence of Communist agitation. There have been frequent reports of similar movements in Yunnan. When, in 1931-32, French imperialism pursued its policy of suppression of separate Soviet regions on the borders of China and Indo-China, it had of necessity to let loose all its fury, not only against the Chinese workers and peasants, but against the toiling national groups as well, which inhabit these parts, and support the Soviet movement. The revolutionary awakening of the toiling masses of oppressed nationalities should be the natural starting point of the whole work of the Chinese Communist Party among them.

In his speech on the political tasks of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East in 1925, Comrade Stalin said:

"It can hardly be doubted that in the event of a *revolutionary upheaval* in India, dozens of *hitherto unknown nationalities, with their own special language*, their own special culture, will come upon the scene" ("Problems of Leninism.")

The anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies is awakening many millions of masses—coolies, the poor, toilers in general—from their historic slumber and stagnation. In shaking them out of their age-long sleep, it fires them with a desire to build up their own independent national State system by throwing off the chains of imperialist and foreign oppression, by building up their own national culture. In ever more widely extending the broad mass front in the struggle against landlords, moneylenders, merchant-compradors* of other nationalities, and then, or at the same time, against imperialism as well, the masses of the oppressed peoples are beginning to understand classes and class divisions in their own circle, are beginning to fight against their exploiters, and against feudal and bourgeois nationalism which drives them towards counter-revolutionary machinations, in an alliance with imperialism. Through a thousand invisible roads the influences of October, of the socialist victories of the Soviet Republics of the East, of the Chinese Soviet movement penetrate among the toilers of the backward nationalities.

Thus the national problems of the non-Chinese nationalities living on China's territory are raised from two angles: on one hand, and this is of chief importance, they are raised by the Chinese revolution which fights and marches forward under the leadership of the Communist Party, they are raised by the toilers of all the oppressed nationalities under the influence of the revolutionary upheaval; on the other hand they are put forward by the imperialist invaders seeking to utilise the oppression of the non-Chinese nationalities by the Chinese exploiting classes in the interests of the dismemberment and further enslavement of China.

Hence the acute and burning character of these problems in the present state of affairs. The general attitude in principle of the Communist Party is perfectly clear: while fighting for the abolition of the imperialist yoke and the unquestionable uprooting of all forms of feudal oppression and feudal usurious exploitation, the working class of China, headed by the Chinese Communist Party, fights for the right of national self-determination to complete separation and the formation of an independent State by all non-Chinese peoples which are oppressed by imperialism, and the Chinese ruling classes. While fighting for the overthrow of the Kuomintang rule and of the different counter-revolutionary militarist cliques the Communist Party of China fights at the

same time for the complete liquidation of the Kuomintang policy of national enslavement. *The victory of the Soviet revolution in China* will bring real national freedom, and guarantees of an independent national State existence to all non-Chinese peoples.

Furthermore, only this victory can free them both of their imperialist noose and of the oppression of the Chinese exploiting classes. Only this victory can create the best conditions for the victory of the toiling masses of the oppressed nationalities over their own exploiters. The Communist Party of China firmly adheres to the policy of uniting the efforts of the toilers of all nations, of consolidating them in a united front of struggle both against the great power nationalism and against the local feudal and bourgeois nationalism.

As far back as March, 1916, Comrade Lenin wrote:

"In all cases where there are oppressed and oppressing nations, where there are no special circumstances singling out the revolutionary-democratic and the reactionary nations (such circumstances existed, for instance, in the forties of the nineteenth century), Marx's policy towards Ireland must serve as an example of proletarian policy. And imperialism is precisely the epoch when the division of the nations into oppressors and oppressed is essential and typical, while it is entirely impossible to draw any line between reactionary and revolutionary nations in Europe."

It was by no means an accident that Comrade Lenin limited to Europe the impossibility of distinguishing the revolutionary democratic nations as against the reactionary nations under the rule of imperialism. *In regards to imperialism* all the colonial and semi-colonial peoples—both those subject to oppressed nations, merely *generally* connected with the imperialist robbers and those suffering both from direct national oppression by imperialism and from national oppression on the part of the exploiting classes of another nation also exploited by imperialism (the non-Chinese nationalities of China)—are oppressed nations connected by a common struggle for the overthrow of the imperialist yoke. Inasmuch as imperialism is attempting to oppose the interests of the nationalities subject to a double yoke to those of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution which has rallied primarily the Chinese masses, it seeks to break through the front of this revolution which is of decisive international importance to the entire east, for the purposes of its annexationist policy. On *this* ground "revolutionary-democratic and reactionary nations" may be distinguished.

Indeed in the forties of the nineteenth century the ruling classes of a number of Slav nations attempted to speculate on the struggle of feudal-

* Comprador: middleman.

landlord controlled tsarism against the European revolution. Their ruling classes sought to convert their masses into a slavish reserve of tsarism, which acted as the *decisive* international reactionary citadel. Consequently, these national movements which sought to achieve this triumph by suppressing the revolution, were *reactionary*. They promised freedom to the Serbians, Bulgarians and other nationalities as a result of the triumph of tsarism. Their support marked the betrayal of the cause of the revolutionary democratic reorganisation of all of Europe.

We find a certain repetition of this under new conditions in modern China. Imperialism is the chief stronghold and basic source of national oppression in every corner of the world. It oppresses and chokes both Chinese, Mongols, the Hoya nationalities in Gansu, etc., etc. It clings to the feudal forms of oppression and exploitation and supports them in order to enslave, strangle and divide up the Chinese and non-Chinese nationalities. An alliance with it or "neutrality" towards it on the part of any national movement of the non-Chinese peoples is tantamount to participation in the struggle of imperialism for the suppression of the Chinese revolution. An agreement with it, at the expense of this emancipation movement, has both a *counter-revolutionary* and *anti-national* character. Tens of millions of Chinese workers and peasants have demonstrated by the long years of struggle against imperialism and against the Chinese bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution that *they cannot be confused* with their exploiting classes, that they are "another nation" which recognises that "no people can be free if it oppresses other nations." Ever growing masses of the Chinese people are becoming activated in this direction.

From this it inevitably follows that a truly revolutionary struggle of the non-Chinese nationalities for *national* freedom is possible, *only on the basis of an uncompromising and consistent struggle against imperialism, only on the basis of a close and unbreakable alliance with the Chinese revolution.*

The Communist Party of China must draw a clear distinction between the mass national movements of the non-Chinese peoples awakened by the struggle against imperialism and feudalism, by the example of the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese Soviet movement and reflecting the progressive tendencies towards national self-determination in a close and unbreakable alliance with the Chinese revolution; and the reactionary movements sponsored by the local feudal and feudal-theocratic classes and serving in one measure or another as vehicles of annexationist plans of imperialism. The Communist Party of China must support the former, must broaden and strengthen the influence of the Chinese revolutionary

movement over them, and must be just as uncompromising to the reactionary national movements.

It is precisely the peculiar and extremely complex conditions of development of the Chinese revolution, particularly at the present stage, which require that the Communist Party of China should make every effort towards attracting the masses of non-Chinese nationalities into the joint revolutionary struggle. It can achieve this by practically and consistently pursuing a Bolshevik policy on the national question. The Communist Party of China fights for the right of national self-determination to State separation of all the non-Chinese peoples which are oppressed by the Chinese propertied classes, and are enslaved, with their aid, by imperialism. It fights for the abolition of the debt slavery and usurious bondage, for the confiscation of all the lands of the Chinese landlords, gentry and militarists who captured these lands from the non-Chinese peoples, and for their division among the oppressed and toiling peasantry of these nationalities. It makes it its immediate task to attract to the Soviet anti-imperialist and anti-feudal movement all the toilers of the non-Chinese nationalities under the condition of giving them the right to use their own language, democratic self-government on a Soviet basis, title to the land, etc. In organising the workers, the poor and the toiling peasantry of the oppressed non-Chinese nationalities the C.P. of China seeks to rally them for the struggle against their own exploiters, under the banner of bourgeois and bourgeois-landlord nationalism defending its anti-national interests.

The Chinese Communists must remember that the entire counter-revolutionary policy of the Kuomintang is permeated with the desire to preserve and perpetuate the great power feudal and feudal-State "rights" of the Chinese propertied classes to oppress the non-Chinese nationalities.

It may be said without the least exaggeration that the Chinese landlords, officials, merchants and usurers who have gained notoriety by their plunderous seizure of Mongolian lands and other properties have cleared the road for Japanese imperialism for the capture of Jehol and the invasion of Chahar. The latter, upon invading these provinces, began by a solemn proclamation of the discontinuation of Chinese colonisation. The imperialists fill every hole and crevice in order to multiply their forces at the expense of the oppressed nations by inciting them against each other. This Chinese great-power chauvinism is being deliberately fostered and supported by Kuomintang, which in doing this, makes references to Sun Yat-senism.

The struggle against these attempts to poison the Chinese toiling masses with the mentality of the gentry, merchants, bourgeoisie and feudals represents, at the same time, a struggle for the strengthening

and extension of the international front of the Chinese revolution. This is a *struggle for the peasant reserves of the Chinese revolution belonging to non-Chinese nationalities*. Without the fullest and most pitiless eradication of every manifestation of great-power chauvinism in its own ranks, and among the Chinese toiling masses, the C.P. of China cannot properly fulfil its international proletarian duty. On the other hand, it cannot arouse against the bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution those outstanding non-Chinese peasant reserves which, in the present attempts to make a new and more thorough unification of China on the part of the imperialists, are destined to play a very important rôle. Only by contributing in this struggle against national oppression and great power chauvinism the confidence of the non-Chinese toiling masses, by acting as their interested assistants in the struggle against imperialism, against national oppression and against their own exploiters will the Chinese Communists succeed in creating *Communist organisations* among these backward nations. Only by unswervingly pursuing this line will they succeed in breaking down the barrier of the traditional national distrust and helping the local proletarian and semi-proletarian movements to conduct a struggle against their feudal and feudal-bourgeois rulers, against the bourgeois and bourgeois-feudal nationalism propagated by them.

In China the processes of the national consolidation of the Chinese people, which is still far from having been completed, owing to the rule of imperialism and feudal relics, cross with the processes of national consolidation of the non-Chinese people which are carried more strongly in the clutches of feudalism. Sun Yat-senism attempted to deduce from this the necessity of assimilation of the non-Chinese nationalities. This was a reflection of the ideology of bourgeois nationalism, which under the pretext of the liberation of its own nation, seeks the means for oppressing others.

The Chinese Communists must remember that in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal Soviet revolution China is overcoming its *division, fractionalism and backwardness* in every respect. It is characteristic that, as a result of the rule of imperialism and feudalism, the maximum industrial progress has been concentrated in six provinces out of eighteen. These provinces are Kiangsi, Liaoning, Hopei, Kwantung, Szechuan and Hupei. They occupy one-tenth of the entire territory and have 36 per cent. of the entire population. In these provinces is concentrated 60 per cent. of the mining industry, 65 per cent. of the total output, 64 per cent. of the iron ore output, 70 per cent. of the cotton industry, 92 per cent. of the spinning industry, 86 per cent. of the seed-oil industry, 88 per cent. of the power stations, 84 per

cent. of the trade, and 92 per cent. of the entire foreign trade, 91 per cent. of the transit trade, 53 per cent. of the railroads, 42 per cent. of the automobile roads and 42 per cent. of the telegraph wires.*

It is this one-sided, uneven and unproportional geographic distribution of the capital investments which enables the imperialist plunderers to prepare and realise their annexationist and interventionist plans, taking advantage of the backwardness, lack of roads, illiteracy, division and down-troddenness of the population.

It is to be regretted that very little has so far been done to study the national problems of China. In its practical work the Chinese Communist Party often devotes insufficient attention to the national problem. The very study of the situation of the Chinese nationalities has in the past been monopolised by the imperialist missionaries and "travellers." The data on the national movements filters into the press with the greatest difficulty while the Kuomintang Press has entered into a conspiracy of silence. Upon the shoulders of the Communists devolves the task of seeing to it that the oppressed non-Chinese nationalities should see their true defenders both against the imperialist and militarist Kuomintang oppression, and imperialist provocations which are growing in frequency, in the Chinese Communists. At the same time, it is necessary to remember that the class struggle among the overwhelming majority of these nationalities which are entangled in the manifold oppression of the imperialists and Chinese militarists, officials, landlords and moneylenders, and of their feudals and feudal "chiefs," has not yet sufficiently progressed to lay a firm foundation for an independent organisation of the poor, as well as of the great masses of the toilers. A concrete approach must be devised for each individual national grouping, on the basis of a consideration of all the peculiarities of the historical development, economic situation, living and cultural conditions. Sheer imposition of Soviet forms from above without regard to the degree of the class differentiation might lead only to fatal results, to the strengthening of the national distrust, to the undermining of the influence of the Soviet movement. The masses are moving forward, digesting their own experience of the struggle, and they must be helped to learn who are their friends and who are their enemies without a shade of external compulsion, particularly on the part of the nation whose exploiting classes continue to oppress the masses of the disfranchised nationality. At the same time, it is carrying on, on this basis, a determined and systematic struggle against the local bourgeois and bourgeois-landlord nationalism, a

* "Problems of the Pacific, 1931." Proceedings of the IV. Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1932, p. 139.

struggle for unity of the toilers of all nationalities, and against all exploiters and oppressors.

2. CONCRETE PROBLEMS.

At the present stage the international national problems of China are primarily problems of the backward national *outsirts*. A separate place is held by *Manchuria*, which is a more developed region than most of the others, and which has its own peculiar strategic importance, inasmuch as Japanese imperialism is converting it into its colony, into a base for the capture of Chinese territories and subsequent attack upon the U.S.S.R., the land of victorious socialism. The bulk of the Manchurian population consists of Chinese. Here the most important task consists of a struggle against Japanese imperialism which oppresses 30 million Chinese. Japanese imperialism incites the Koreans, whom it had driven out of Korea itself and enslaved in Manchuria as cropsharers and tenant farmers, against the Chinese national emancipation movement. It does the same with the Mongolian districts of Manchuria. The Chinese Communist Party is perfectly correct in urging the toiling Chinese, Koreans and Mongolians to a joint partisan struggle against the invaders, to a joint boycott of the taxes and orders of the occupationist authorities and of Manchukuo, to a joint struggle for the creation of an elected government of the people that would insure the rights of all the national minorities, for the confiscation of the factories, lands and property of the Japanese imperialist and of their Chinese, Korean and Mongolian agents. It advocates a refusal to pay all rent to the Japanese, Chinese and Korean landlords, to pay debts. It favours the creation of an elected Korean popular government in the district of Kiang-Tao in a fraternal union with the revolutionary movement in Korea. At the same time it fights against the attempts of the Japanese imperialists to annex this region under the pretext of a union with Korea, which languishes in hopeless colonial slavery. As regards the Mongolian districts, there the special slogans of the struggle against the seizure of the lands by the Chinese landlords, kulaks and merchants, against the granting of land to the Chinese rich by the Mongolian princes and monasteries, against any deals with Japanese imperialism at the expense of the Mongolian and Chinese toiling masses, must naturally be added.

In *Inner Mongolia*, Japanese imperialism flaunts Pan-Mongolian cloaks which are most convenient to it, both from the point of view of inciting the Mongols against the Chinese, and preparing an attack upon the Mongolian People's Republic and the U.S.S.R. Already in 1919 a "Pan-Mongolian Government" was set up at Dauri with the participation of feudals from Barga and Buryato-Mongolian nationalist

politicians. This Government was a tool of Japanese imperialism in the anti-Soviet intervention. Japanese imperialism is now spreading its Pan-Mongolian net with special zeal, seeking to transform the Mongols into its blind weapon for an attack upon the Mongolian People's Republic, and for a new anti-Soviet intervention. It feeds the Mongolian secular and ecclesiastical parasites, headed by Panchen-La and the feudal outcasts, who have fled from the Mongolian People's Republic. It makes provocative gestures against Chinese colonisation, and at the same time selects rallying grounds for its future robbery and plunder. The Lamas and feudals are the best vehicle for its policy of subjecting and strangling the Mongolian masses, particularly in Inner Mongolia, under the slogan of Pan-Mongolism. A union of all Mongols, under the aegis of the feudal chiefs, will reward the Mongols by an "All-Mongolian" whip of Japanese imperialism.

Pressed by Chinese colonisation, the Mongolian tribes of Inner Mongolia, who number between two and three million people, have already become converted into a national minority in a number of regions. Imperialism, primarily Japanese—coupled with American and European imperialism, want to entangle the Mongolian masses in a cobweb of slavery and debt bondage which is being woven by the numerous banks, commercial companies and Catholic monasteries, which possess vast stretches of land. Together with it, and assisting it, the Chinese militaristic, landlord and usurious merchants suck the blood of the Mongolian masses like leeches, and share the power with the Mongolian-feudal parasites, the Wanguns, Ambans, Fudutungs, etc. The Mongols are being driven from the land, the Mongolian pastures are being ploughed up, the Mongols are deprived of the forests, salt lakes, etc. The most important region of the Mongol national movement is the western section of Inner Mongolia, the Suifu Province, where the colonisation movement causes a sharp situation at the present moment and where Japanese imperialism has not yet consolidated its positions. Here, under the influence of the victory of the national revolution in Outer Mongolia, has developed a broad national movement spreading practically the whole of the south (Ordos) and resulting in the creation of an elected popular Government, independent of the feudal chiefs, in one of the districts.

The common task of the Mongolian national revolutionary movement consists of its consolidation on an anti-imperialist and national emancipation foundation. The Communist Party of China unquestionably recognises the right of the Mongols to State independence. It will have to carry out much work in order to organise a united front of the Chinese revolution, of the Chinese toiling masses and

of the masses of the Mongolians. This united front must be directed against the Pan-Mongolian conspiracy of Japanese imperialism, against all of its machinations, against Pan-Mongolianism, as an imperialist agency. The purification of the Mongolian national movement of the reactionary-interventionist scum and filth is possible only if the struggle against the Chinese oppressors and the Kuomintang is united with the most uncompromising fight against Japanese imperialism, and its Mongolian agency, for friendly relations with the Mongolian People's Republic and the U.S.S.R., for a union with the Chinese revolution.

The backwardness of the social-economic structure and the relatively weak development of the class struggle of the toiling fraternity against the feudal, religious and secular chiefs retards the consolidation of the revolutionary forces. The princes, the Noyons, the Gegens, this Mongolian feudal aristocracy no longer wishes anything in common with the struggle of the masses. They act as accomplices of imperialism, and of a certain section of the Chinese conquerors. The average class of Lamas, who have lost their former privileges, may participate in the early stages of the struggle against the rule of the Chinese exploiters, but cannot be depended upon in the struggle against imperialism. Taking all this into consideration, it is necessary to advance, in the first place, the slogan of struggle against imperialism, particularly Japanese, on the one hand, and, on the other, the demand for the confiscation of the large Chinese herds, which are made up of cattle that has been seized from the Arats, the abolition of all militarist taxes and moneylending slavery, the confiscation of the salt lakes, *the confiscation of the big Chinese estates and of the possessions of the Catholic monasteries*. Measures must be taken, of course, to ensure the rights of the Chinese peasants and farm labourers who lease these lands and work on them. The discontinuation of the forcible colonisation must naturally become one of the demands of this struggle. The rallying of the masses to this national existence will make it possible to advance as the immediate tasks in the struggle against the Mongolian feudals the demands for (1) non-payment of taxes to the princes, Ambans and Fudutungs; (2) non-payment of the debts of the princes; (3) exposure of the treacherous and plundering rôle of the princes and Gegens, and (4) the direct abolition of the feudal power of the princes, Noyons and big Taiji by the confiscation of the great feudal estates, the abolition of serfdom, of the inequality of the social estates, the feudal duties and the reciprocal responsibility.

A specifically local national question in Kansu, a province which has for ages served as a bridge from the Mongolian steppes to the settled communities of China, is the Hoyan national question. The Hoyan

population lives at Kansu, Shensi and Ninhsia, and constitutes more than half the total population of the western and south-western parts of Kansu and Ninhsia. There are altogether about four million of them. The population is separated from the rest of the masses externally by their adherence to Islamism, but essentially they are bound together by common territory, a common economic system, closely similar dialects and identical cultural and living forms. The main regions inhabited by the Hoyan people are under the control of the Chinese parasitic classes, who in Gansu, share their power with the so-called Moslem militarists from among the five "Ma." The Chinese invaders exploit the Hoyan masses by various taxes and duties, by exchange swindles, etc. Chinese capital, while playing in a certain measure, the rôle of a comprador in relation to the imperialist interests has gained control of trade and moneylending. The Hoyan population has been pressed back to the inferior lands and the Chinese landlord or big tenant (for instance, in Ninhsia) enslaves the native peasant. About three-quarters of the entire land is controlled by Chinese and Hoyan landlords. The administrative machinery (with the exception of the sphere of influence of the "Ma" who are robbing and ruining the Chinese peasants in many places), the courts and the schools are monopolised by the Chinese parasitic class. The demoralisation of the Kuomintang governing apparatus, coupled with the growth of imperialist intrigues and machinations at Kansu, has forced a section of the "Ma" to take up a struggle against the Chinese monopolists for the power and revenues, and placed them at the head of a great popular movement which began in 1928, and was suppressed by the Chinese authorities in 1931, although the movement still exists on a smaller scale.

The agrarian crisis has tremendously strengthened the mass discontent with the national oppression and enslavement and resulted in the first spontaneous manifestations of class differentiation in the national movement. The more progressive section of the poor classes and of the peasantry began to appreciate the real intentions of the feudal "national liberators." This resulted in attempts to create in Ninhsia, Ganchow and Lanchow independent detachments hostile to the feudal Hoyan militarists, in attempts to establish connections with the Mongolian People's Republic and with the revolution in Inner Mongolia, in serious actions on the part of the poor and peasant masses aimed against the landlords and moneylenders. The adjacent province of Shansi where many Hoyans live, became famous in 1926-27 by the powerful development of the present revolutionary movement. There are certain symptoms of formation, in the upper layers of the Hoyan national movement, of a more progressive tendency seeking to

weaken the guardianship of the Ulems (the Moslem clergy), the militarists and the big landed feudals.

The *present* state of the movement forces the Chinese Communist Party to start developing its work under the slogan of a struggle for a *Hoyan democratic republic* in a fraternal alliance with the Chinese revolution, against the Hoyan and Chinese militarists, against the landlords and moneylenders of all nations, for the cancellation of all enslaving business deals and loans and the abolition of the debt slavery and social inequality, for the independent organisation of the farm labourers and poor peasants. The national revolution under the conditions of Kansu must inevitably be also an *agrarian* revolution. But the transition from the agrarian revolution against the Chinese militarists, landlords and moneylenders to a revolutionary fight of the Hoyan farm labourers and peasants against their own Hoyan feudals will be conditioned by the degree of the revolutionisation and democratisation of the bulk of the national movement itself. Only by developing on the basis of a struggle against both the Kuomintang and the present local reactionary feudal classes as represented by the five "Ma," only if an independent organisation of the proletarian and semi-proletarian masses of the Hoyan people is formed, only if Communist organisations are formed in Kansu, will the national emancipation movement be able to develop into an open and conscious fight against the landlords, moneylenders, militarists and feudal officials.

The Soviet movement is beginning to develop in the neighbourhood of Kansu and in Kansu itself. Even this alone creates the possibility of setting up *Communist organisations* of coolies, farm labourers, the poor and the advanced peasantry in many parts of Kansu. On the other hand, the Chinese Communist Party cannot refuse to support any movement opposed to the Chinese exploiting classes, if it does not serve as a vehicle for annexationist and interventionist plans. The prospect of the creation of a Hoyan democratic republic is inseparable from the turn of the entire movement in the direction of the Chinese revolution. The subsequent transition to Soviets accompanied by a deeper class differentiation will be possible on this road alone.

By actively demanding State independence for the Hoyan people, the Chinese Communist Party will succeed in finding independent revolutionary forces in Kansu, in exercising the necessary influence over their organisation, in helping to organise the proletarians, semi-proletarians and peasants among those who have been influenced heretofore chiefly by their own feudals, mullahs and usurious merchants.

Sinkiang, two-thirds of whose population consist of Ugurs, Taranchins as well as Mongols, Cossacks and Tungans, represents a Chinese colony governed

on the basis of military feudal slavery. The Chinese national minority constitutes a small section of the population, but the Chinese exploiting classes, and the imperialist agency utilise in their own interests the intricate mosaic of national relationships, which makes it possible to incite the different nationalities against each other. British imperialism, which is the most active, is stretching out its hand for oil, coal and other mineral resources of Sinkiang and is feverishly working over the task of converting Sinkiang into an explosive mine at the very border of the Soviet republics of the east, exploiting the discontent of the population with the Chinese yoke. Japanese imperialism has also included Sinkiang in its plans of annexation and intervention.

The Communist Party of China is opposed to a "national self-determination" of the peoples of Sinkiang under which the different nationalities, under the leadership of their feudal parasites will be cutting each others' throats and acting as springboards for imperialist adventures. They are for a united front of all the peoples of Sinkiang against imperialism and its agency, for a national emancipation struggle in alliance with the Chinese revolution, and a friendly attitude towards the great land of socialist construction. The Communist Party of China is establishing its strongholds in Sinkiang and helping to organise national revolutionary parties from among the best and advanced revolutionary representatives of the toiling peoples of Sinkiang. The Communist Party of China unconditionally recognises the right of the peoples of Sinkiang to a free national existence and resolutely opposes both the oppressive policy of Kuomintang, and all the annexationist and interventionist plans of imperialism.

The national problems of the non-Chinese peoples and national minorities of *Southern China* are even more complicated and involved, firstly, because they have not been sufficiently studied, and secondly, because of the extreme national diversity of the population of the southern provinces which were Chinised later than the others. The biggest national groups, which have already been shaped both historically and in consequence of a series of real national traits, are the *Tai* (or *Shai*) peoples inhabiting Yunnan, Kwangsi, Guichow and Kwangtung (about seven million people) and constituting a considerable section of the population of Siam and Burma (about 13 million); the Mon people (known under the Chinese chauvinist nickname of Miao-tsi), which inhabit Guichow, Kwangsi, Hunan and Kwantung (the Hinang Island); the Nosu peoples (whom the Chinese nickname Lolo) inhabiting Yunnan, Szechwan, Guichow (and Burma); the Yaotsi people inhabiting Kwantung, Kwangsi and Yunnan, together with so-called Moslem national

minorities in a number of districts who migrated there in connection with the development of trade in the Middle Ages, and the conquestal crusades. All of these peoples with the exception of the "Moslem" minorities, remain at a very low level of economic development. The Chinese invaders have driven them from the most fertile lands into the mountains, the jungles, and outlying regions far removed from the great trade routes. They are oppressed by ages of reaction and hopeless stagnation. Where they have preserved their independent social-economic backbone, as for instance is the case of the Nosu, they are fettered by chains of classic feudalism ; the Nosu are serfs of their feudal aristocracy living in castles, having armed forces and acting as compradors in the interests of the Chinese oppressors. The Mon, where they have not yet been completely subjugated by the Chinese oppressors, generally live under conditions of a "pure" natural economy, being engaged in hunting, cattle-breeding and agriculture.

The power of patriarchal and feudal relations among these peoples is naturally very great. At the same time slavery still survives here in a considerable measure. The Chinese landlords who captured all the fertile lands, the Chinese moneylenders who are keeping these peoples under conditions of debt slavery, the Chinese militarists and gentry who are strangling them by innumerable taxes and duties almost literally drive them off the face of the earth. Their monstrous mistreatment of these oppressed nationalities is developed by them to the point of proclaiming these peoples to be "men with tails" "akin to monkeys." At the same time, the Chinese slave-drivers and serf-owners utilise some of the more developed peoples as a weapon for the further enslavement of others. Thus the Moslem feudals and merchants act as compradors and enslavers of the Mon, Tai and other nationalities. The Mon, Yao and "Moslem" minorities took an active part in the Taiping revolution and in the Yunnan uprising of the '70s. The non-Chinese nationalities of South China actively participated in the peasant movement in 1926-27 and in the Soviet movement in Western Kwangsi and on the Hainan Island.

All of these essentially peasant nationalities, which are making only their first steps in the direction of their national development with the aid of the Chinese revolution must certainly exercise a serious influence upon the further victorious development of the revolution in the struggle against world imperialism and the Chinese bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution. The destruction of the Chinese feudal and landlord system in South China which has assumed considerable dimensions serves as a powerful impulse to the development of the national movements of these peoples, as an impetus to arousing them against the Chinese militarists, the gentry,

moneylenders and landlords. The national kinship between these peoples and those of Indo-China, Burma and Siam justifies the assumption that these national movements will find a strong response beyond the Chinese boundaries as well. They will help to throw a bridge from the Chinese revolution to the borders of Indo-China and India. The Soviet movement is developing in close proximity to these peoples ; this connection is spreading in consequence of the progress of the *Soviet movement* in Szechwan.

The Chinese Communists are vitally interested in attracting the toiling masses of these backward nationalities to their side. They must display the greatest care and an ability to approach the needs and demands of these masses concretely, on the basis of the strictest consideration of all the peculiarities of their economic, living and cultural standards. This means that there must be no "Sovietisation" from above by means of administrative orders, that a ruthless fight must be carried on against great-power chauvinism and all manifestations of great-power indifference to the backward national conditions, patient education and organisation of the forces of the farm labourers, poor peasants and toilers on the basis of their *vital interests and of the experience of their own struggle*. Only under this policy will it be possible successfully to combat the local nationalism in Mongolia, Sinkiang and Manchuria which is already openly siding with imperialism in its interventionist plans ; only by the use of this policy will it be possible effectively to separate the toiling masses from their "own" exploiters covering themselves up by talk of national unity and pit these masses against the latter. The experience of the Soviet regions must be summed up in this field for it is impossible to under-estimate its exceptional value.

The slogans of the Communist Party of China among the non-Chinese peoples of South China cannot but include the demand for the creation of a national revolutionary power where the united national front has not yet split up and where it has repulsed only the feudal class which serves as comprador for the national oppressors. The creation of Soviets of toilers is possible where the organisation of the poor has already been shaped into an independent body and where the toiling peasant masses are prepared to overthrow not only the Chinese, but their own feudals, landlords, moneylenders, etc. The confiscation of the lands of the Chinese landlords and native upper classes connected with the Kuomintang and Chinese militarists, the complete abolition of slavery, reciprocal responsibility, feudal duties and caste oppression, the liquidation of the "Tuses," of the local rulers—a programme advanced already in 1925-27—real and full equality with the Chinese, all these demands

are demands which can be advanced on the basis of the existing experience of the national movements.

The Chinese Communist Party fights for the right to self-determination of the non-Chinese peoples of South China, making its immediate task the *creation on the Soviet territories of model national regions* in which the native language enjoys full rights and the national majorities enjoy full self-government. It seeks to establish friendly connections with the national movements opposed to the Chinese exploiting classes but not yet grown to the Soviet stage.

It would be senseless to attempt at present to give a complete scheme of the solution of all the national problems in China. Experience will bring a mass of new problems in connection with the awakening of new millions. One thing is obvious, however: the united front of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution with the Soviet movement as its backbone represents a necessary condition to the development of the national movements along revolutionary lines.

The joint struggle against common enemies will prepare and bring into being those forms of the joint co-existence of a number of independent nations which will be most expedient from the point of view of their common interests and particularly from the point of view of their transition by a common effort, *towards non-capitalists, that is, socialist development*. The example of the U.S.S.R. in this respect provides an unmistakable solution.

The national problems of China are still awaiting their investigation. The existing data are extremely meagre, there is very little data on record in regard to the solution of these problems. Therefore the concrete solution of these problems requires a most extensive and most detailed discussion in the ranks of the Communist Party of China. The general direction, the general tendency of the theoretical and practical work is given in the fundamental principles of the Marxian-Leninist doctrine of the national-colonial question.

DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION IN THE MATTER OF FELIX WOLF AND ERICH WOLLENBERG.

IN spite of bloody terror and the arrest of many thousands of its members, the Communist Party of Germany is heroically conducting the struggle against the furiously raging Fascist dictatorship. Tens of thousands of German Communists are displaying exemplary self-sacrificing devotion to their Party, led by its Bolshevik Central Committee. The Fascist dictatorship is unable to smash the C.P. of Germany by means of open terror. It is therefore resorting to the weapon of calumny and slander against the leadership of the Party, as well as against individual leaders and functionaries, in order to sow confusion among the masses and to shake their confidence in their only revolutionary leader. The Fascist dictatorship is utilising for this purpose those vacillating, petty-bourgeoisie elements who were already formerly in opposition to the Party and who have become estranged from any real Party activity.

After dealing with the matter of *Felix Wolf*, member of the Communist Party since 1917,

and *Erich Wollenberg*, member of the Communist Party since 1919, both of whom have carried on anti-party fraction work against the C.P. of Germany and have already been reprimanded on the basis of Party discipline (*Felix Wolf* formerly belonged to the oppositional group of Brandler, later to that of the Trotskyists, was expelled from the Party and afterwards readmitted, whilst *Erich Wollenberg* was in opposition to the Party leadership during the past year and was suspended from all Party activity on account of this oppositional activity) — the International Control Commission records that, considering the fact that these two persons have continued their fight against the C.P.G., in spite of the Fascist dictatorship in Germany, and have spread anti-Party views as well as slanders about the Party leadership, they have thereby objectively become the agents of the class enemy.

Proceeding from these facts, the I.C.C. decides to expel *Felix Wolf* and *Erich Wollenberg* from the Communist Party.